published monthly since 1866

Fortnightly

FOUNDED IN 1865 BY ANTHONY TROLLOPE

PTEMBER, 1951 MXVII N.S.

Illinois U Library

CONTENTS

QUEVILLE AND THE AMERICANS — MAX BELOFF
FRENCH ELECTIONS — PHILIP M. WILLIAMS
SINGAPORE RIOTS — C. NORTHCOTE PARKINSON
ET SATELLITE ARMIES IN EUROPE—I. — K. M. SMOGORZEWSKI
VARDS WORLD GOVERNMENT — GILBERT McALLISTER, M.P.
ROAD TO MUNICH — OWEN TWEEDY
INDIVIDUAL AND SOCIAL PURPOSE—II. — LOUIS ARNAUD REID
LISH POETRY: 1938-1950—I. — HERBERT PALMER
ORIAN FAMILY LIFE IN THE HEBRIDES — JOAN CURL

spondence:
THE SCHUMAN PACT
THE INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICA

The Fortnightly Library:
CTS OF SHAKESPEARE — FREDERICK S. BOAS

Contributors: David Thomson, Walter James, Gordon Winter, G. F. McCleary, Patric Dickinson, John Eales, Grace Banyard.

3S. 6D. or 55 CENTS
DA 60 CENTS

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

42S. PER ANNUM or U.S.A. $6.50 CANADA $7 00

ALL CLASSES OF INSURANCE TRANSACTED

MOTOR UNION
INSURANCE COMPANY LIMITED
10, ST. JAMES'S STREET, LONDON, S.W.I

Welcome to the Inns of Britain

beer is best

Issued by the Brewers' Society, 42 Portman Square, London, W.1

THE FORTNIGHTLY

Published Monthly by The Fortnightly Review, Ltd., at 4, 5 & 6, Soho Sq., London, W.1.

SEPTEMBER, 1951

CONTENTS

	PAGE
TOCQUEVILLE AND THE AMERICANS. BY MAX BELOFF	573
THE FRENCH ELECTIONS. BY PHILIP M. WILLIAMS	580
THE SINGAPORE RIOTS. BY C. NORTHCOTE PARKINSON	590
SOVIET SATELLITE ARMIES IN EUROPE—I. BY K. M. SMOGORZEWSKI ...	597
TOWARDS WORLD GOVERNMENT. BY GILBERT MCALLISTER, M.P. ...	605
THE ROAD TO MUNICH. BY OWEN TWEEDY	613

1
POOR MOTHER
2
AILING CHILDREN
all 3 CAN
HAVE A WEEK'S HOLIDAY IN A
CHURCH ARMY HOLIDAY HOME
for 4 GUINEAS

Your gifts for Holiday Home work would be gratefully acknowledged by

The Reverend E. Wilson Carlisle, General Secretary,
CHURCH ARMY HEADQUARTERS 55, Bryanston Street, London W.1.

CONTENTS—*contd.*

PAGE

THE INDIVIDUAL AND SOCIAL PURPOSE—II. BY LOUIS ARNAUD REID ... 618

ENGLISH POETRY : 1938-1950—I. BY HERBERT PALMER 624

VICTORIAN FAMILY LIFE IN THE HEBRIDES. BY JOAN CURL 629

Correspondence :

THE SCHUMAN PACT. LEWIS GALANTIERE 632

THE INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICA. C. W. M. GELL 633

THE FORTNIGHTLY LIBRARY :

ASPECTS OF SHAKESPEARE. BY FREDERICK S. BOAS 634

Other Contributors: *David Thomson, Walter James, Gordon Winter, G. F. McCleary, Patric Dickinson, John Eales, Grace Banyard.*

¶ While the Editor is glad to consider articles offered for publication, he cannot undertake to return MSS. unless accompanied by a stamped envelope.

¶ The Editorial, Advertising and General Business Offices of THE FORTNIGHTLY are at 4, 5 & 6, Soho Square, London, W.1.

¶ Entered as second-class matter, January 4, 1934, at the Post Office at New York, N.Y. under the Act of March 3, 1897 (Sec. 397 P.L. & R.).

¶ Registered for transmission by Canadian Magazine Post.

WHERE TO STAY

WELLINGTON HOTEL

TUNBRIDGE WELLS.

Delightfully situated at the summit of the Common facing South. Private suites at moderate terms. Lock-up Garage. Passenger Lift. First - class management.

Hot and cold water and gas fires in bedrooms.

UNSURPASSED FOR SITUATION AND SERVICE

Telephone : 1150. *Proprietors :* Trust Houses Ltd.

LASTINGHAM GRANGE HOTEL, YORKSHIRE

A charming country house on Yorkshire's beautiful moors. Own farm and garden produce. Genuine hospitality. Terms 5gns. to 8gns. Brochure sent on request. Tel. Lastingham 45.

LLANGOLLEN. Hand Hotel. One of the best in N. Wales. H. & C. water all rooms. Facing River Dee, free fishing (trout). A.A. & R.A.C. Tel. 3207.

ENGLAND'S DISTRESS AND PERPLEXITY

will increase

UNTIL THE BISHOPS OPEN

JOANNA SOUTHCOTT'S BOX

OF SEALED WRITINGS

What the Bible says about the Box and the Bishops :

" Behold, ye despisers, and wonder, and perish (private opinion) : for I work a work in your days, a work which ye shall in no wise believe, though a man (woman) declare it unto you." (Acts xiii. 41.)

For Information and Free Leaflets write to:—

THE PANACEA SOCIETY,

Bedford, England

THE FORTNIGHTLY

SEPTEMBER, 1951

TOCQUEVILLE AND THE AMERICANS

BY MAX BELOFF

IF political philosophers were quoted on 'change instead of in the class-room, the last few years would have seen a steady rise in the price of Tocqueville. It is no disrespect to Mr. J. P. Mayer to suggest that it was an intelligent investment (in this case of his talents as an expositor) in the fortunes of Tocqueville's reputation at a comparatively early stage in the boom, that led to his selection for the all-important task of giving to the world a new complete edition of Tocqueville's works and correspondence, the first since the 1860's. This undertaking has had the backing of the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique in France and of the Rockefeller Foundation through the National Institute of Economic and Social Research in London and represents a co-operative endeavour of international scholarship of which all concerned may well be proud. The National Commission set up by the French Ministries concerned to supervise the project contains the names of R. H. Tawney and Christopher Dawson as well as that of the late Harold Laski who wrote a characteristic introduction to the *Democracy in America*, the first part of the edition to reach publication.* Nor is so impressively international an effort unjustified ; for as Mr. Mayer shows in an interesting appendix—one of his few personal contributions to a commendably unobtrusive piece of editing—the influence of this great book has been of profound importance in almost every country in which the democratic idea has been discussed—but above all of course in France itself, in the United States and in Great Britain.

Apart from Mr. Mayer's notes which are chiefly bibliographical, the new edition is based directly upon that of 1850, the last one to be corrected by Tocqueville himself. And it contains as that one did, two subsidiary items : a brief disquisition on Swiss democracy presented in the form of a review to the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences in January 1848, and the text of the remarkable speech made by Tocqueville in the chamber of deputies on the 27th of that month in which, with uncanny prescience, he foretold the imminent outbreak of the revolution that was to sweep away the July Monarchy. What we have, then, is the *Democracy* as

* *Oeuvres Complètes* d'Alexis de Tocqueville, édition definitive publiée sous la direction de J. P. Mayer. Tome I. *De la Démocratie en Amérique*. Paris. Librairie Gallimard. 2 vols. 1,350 francs.

Tocqueville a century ago wished us to have it. And although later volumes of this edition, notably the "English Correspondence" which is due fairly early on, will contain elements of greater novelty it is worth having the *Democracy* before us by itself, and considering it for the light it can throw on two great questions of our own day.

The first of these is a matter that will primarily concern the professional historian and student of politics; it is the question of whether and to what extent contemporary history can be studied in a truly scholarly and detached spirit; and whether such studies are possible without some guiding principle of interpretation, without the aid that is, of what its opponents are apt to sneer at as "meta history". As Mr. Christopher Dawson recently indicated in a remarkable little essay in *History To-day*, those who condemn "meta-history" and laud Tocqueville have their work cut out to prove their consistency.

But it is the second question—the light this great imaginative work of interpretation can still throw on the American scene—that may seem the more important from the practical point of view, even though the two questions are not of course wholly disconnected. Tocqueville's famous prophecy that the future of the world belonged to two races only, the Slav and the Anglo-Saxon, has been all too fully and dramatically justified. And if we tend to look at the Russians more eagerly because with greater uncertainty and foreboding, it is nevertheless far more likely that it is the American side of the balance that will weigh heavier in the long run, and it is to interpreting American democracy that we should still turn if we are endeavouring to understand the dominant trends of our own age.

It may be argued that to examine Tocqueville's book from this narrow angle is unfair not only because it discounts the history of the 130 years that have elapsed since the two young French aristocrats Tocqueville and Beaumont paid their brief but celebrated visit to the America of Andrew Jackson, but because it ignores Tocqueville's own description of his work and its object. As he told John Stuart Mill, America provided only the framework; his real subject was democracy and the laws of its development which he believed to be universal. Nor should one forget the well-known limitations upon Tocqueville's own sources of information about the America of his day or the errors to which these gave rise. Least of all has this been permissible since Professor G. W. Pierson's admirable *Tocqueville and Beaumont in America* laid a solid groundwork of factual knowledge, upon which Harold Laski drew fully in his introduction to the present edition.

Yet the curious fact remains that, notwithstanding the coming of democracy, as Tocqueville had foreseen, for other countries in the western world, and more particularly his own and England, the two he knew best, the *Democracy* continues to portray to the modern reader

ot some undifferentiated democratic scheme, but a living society—
nd that society is unmistakably American. Of course Tocqueville
as right in his belief that democracy in the broadest sense had
ecome an inevitable consequence of the way in which the western
orld was developing ; of course he was correct in saying that the
ask of those who cared for liberty was not to combat democracy
ith a blind hatred—the charge he brought against the Swiss writer
e was reviewing on the eve of 1848—but to seek for those things
hich, within a democracy, might yet act as barriers against the total
xtinction of the individual in the face of an all-pervading levelling
endency. He could afford to ignore the taunt of Guizot that he was
imply a conquered aristocrat who accepted his defeat ; because to
ccept the defeat was a necessary preliminary to transcending it.
he fact remains that when these generalities are brought down to
arth, it is American democracy we are still concerned with and not
imply the democracy of Andrew Jackson, but that of Harry Truman
oo. It is this quality of relevance, here and now, that gives actu-
lity to Tocqueville, while a book like Bryce's, nearer us in time and
he product of a much more extensive and scientific study of the
ubject, has for us now only an historical not to say antiquarian
nterest. A United States whose frontier of settlement has extended
rom the Mississippi to the Pacific, whose population is twelve times
s great as in Andrew Jackson's day, and which has seen the British
lement in that population numerically submerged through decades of
ntensive immigration from the continent, a United States which has
merged from the self-imposed isolation of a distant and second-
ank power to play the dominant rôle in world politics, a United
States which has seen a prodigious accretion of the federal power—
his new United States is still essentially, in the things that make
t different from western Europe or from Britain, the United States
hat Tocqueville saw when he landed in New York after more days
n the boat than the slowest 'plane would take hours to-day. There
s no greater testimony to his genius.

Whether this claim is too far-reaching the readers of Mr. Mayer's
dition must judge for themselves—wishing perhaps that an
nabridged and adequate English translation were available also.
n a brief article the salient points can be recalled. In the first place,
Tocqueville's method of approach would lead one to expect that if he
vere right in his general conclusions, he would be right not only
or his generation but for a long way ahead. For as he himself
nsisted, institutions which are mutable are of only secondary
mportance in determining the destinies of a people. These destinies
re the product of their national and social characteristics and of the
tock of general ideas implicit in their social arrangements or held by
hem in the form of dogmas. And there can be no doubt that

Tocqueville's Americans—with their self-confidence, their touchines where their own ways are concerned and their tendency to judge al others by them, with, above all their restless energy and the spiri of practical contrivance which Tocqueville regarded as one of th main advantages of a democracy—are well recognizable to-day i their descendants, and in the descendants of those later immigrant who have been subjected to the powerful process of cultural assimi lation.

In a chapter significantly entitled : " Why the Americans seen so restless in the midst of their prosperity ", Tocqueville writes :

> In the United States a man builds his house to spend his latter years in and sells i before the roof is on ; he plants a garden and lets it just as the fruit trees are begin ning to bear; he brings a field under cultivation and leaves other men to gather th harvest ; he takes up a profession and gives it up ; he settles in some place and soo afterwards leaves it to carry elsewhere his fluctuating desires. If his privat affairs leave him any leisure, he instantly plunges into the vortex of politics ; an if at the end of a year of unremitting labour he finds he has a few days vacation he transports his eager curiosity hither and thither within the vast limits of the Unite States. He will thus cover five hundred leagues in a few days in order the bette to provide some distraction from his happiness.

Apart from the fact that politics is a more infrequent leisure occupation as the result of the growing professionalization of politic which Tocqueville's observation missed, one might almost think tha the Americans had spent the last 110 years in living up to Tocqueville' opinion of them.

Within this essentially fluid and egalitarian world, knowing none o the barriers of rank and culture that still divided an essentially aristocratic society such as that of contemporary England, cohesion was provided by the acceptance of certain general ideas. Nor would Tocqueville be surprised to find many of them still persisting into a later age ; for as he argued, whatever might be true of the small democracies of the ancient world, a constant fluctuation in feeling and sentiment was not an aspect of modern democracy as illustrated by the Americans.

> Two things are surprising in the United States—the mutability of most human actions, and the singular stability of certain principles. Men are in constant motion the mind of man appears almost unmoved. When once an opinion has spread over the country and taken root there, it would seem that no power on earth is strong enough to eradicate it. In the United States, general principles in religion, philosophy, morality, and even politics, do not vary or at least are only modified by a hidden and often imperceptible process : even the grossest prejudices are obliterated with incredible slowness, amidst the continual friction of men and things. . . I do not think it is easy as is supposed to uproot the prejudices of a democratic people—to change its beliefs—to supersede principles once established, by new principles in religion, politics and morals—in a word, to make great and frequent changes in men's minds. Not that the human mind is there at rest—it is constant agitation ; but it is engaged in infinitely varying consequences of known principles. It is engaged in turning in agile fashion upon its own axis, rather than in moving

apidly and directly forward. Little by little it extends its orbit through small ontinuous and hasty movements ; but it does not suddenly displace it.

Despite the New Deal, and despite the seemingly permanent entry the United States into the arena of world politics, this analysis ems to shed equal light upon the kind of shift the American outlook s undergone and upon the obstacles to its shifting more rapidly. ove all, it helps to explain the prodigious efforts that American tesmen must always make to convince their public that whatever partures are made can be accounted for in terms of this original ck of general ideas. Nor are these ideas likely to permit of the tleties which modern politics, particularly international politics, mands. For, as Tocqueville points out in another passage, " in litics, as well as in philosophy and in religion, the intellect of mocratic nations is peculiarly open to simple and general notions. mplicated systems are repugnant to it, and its favourite conception hat of a great nation composed of citizens all resembling the same ttern, and all governed by a single power." May not this help to plain in part the curious persistence of the American belief in the ssibility and desirability of a European federation ? But this is rhaps to press on a weak point : " Do not " said Tocqueville, get an American to talk about Europe. He will normally display eat presumption and a rather foolish pride. He will content mself with those general and indefinite notions that in every country e of such great help to the ignorant. But ask him about his own untry and you will at once see vanish the cloud which enveloped his elligence. His language will become clear and precise to match thought." Recent experience might cause a modification in the rshness of the former judgment ; the second must on the whole sustained. What then of America's internal polity ?

Here the interrogation of Americans to-day would on the whole nfirm what was perhaps the most important of all Tocqueville's ights, namely that with the disappearance of aristocracy and the gen- l percolation of egalitarian ideas, two consequences would follow. In e first place, there would be a tendency to concentrate in education on the normal rather than the exceptional, so that though few uld be wholly without instruction, few comparatively would be pelled to seek the highest honours. Tocqueville at the very begin- ngs of America's industrial revolution foresaw that it would be rked by an extreme ingenuity in screwing the maximum of practical e out of fundamental principles often discovered in other countries. e emphasis would be on the exploitation of the discovery rather than the discovery itself. One might be having a century's preview of e story of penicillin. From this observation, Tocqueville drew e deduction that still stands, that the real anxiety of democratic vernments should be to encourage fundamental research and

scholarship ; applied science could safely be left to look after it own interests (though this of course can only apply to a relatively free and competitive economy).

The second consequence of the disappearance of aristocracy would be the domination of public opinion. This is true both at the level of general ideas and of daily political action. Perhaps the former is the more important. Indeed the very heart of Tocqueville's perception of the dangers inherent in a democracy lies in the passage in which he points out how a citizen of a democracy, although feeling himself fully the equal of any other citizen, is overwhelmed by the sense of his own insignificance and weakness when he surveys the whole body of his fellows :

> The public has therefore among a democratic people a singular power, of which aristocratic nations could never so much as conceive an idea ; for it does not persuade them to certain opinions, but enforces them, and infuses into them the faculties by a sort of enormous pressure of the minds of all upon the reason of each

Tocqueville would find it hard to say to-day that he knew of no country in which there was " so little true independence of mind and freedom of discussion as in America." The totalitarian spectre with its physical and psychological weapons did not yet stalk the earth though one thinks that Tocqueville would have understood it had he lived to see it. But when one thinks of what constraints do exist in America, and in particular of the readiness with which they are on the whole accepted, one is brought face to face with some of the fundamental phenomena that Tocqueville observed. How could a great university like that of California accept, until rescued by the courts, the imposition of the " oath ", or the public be willing to see the humiliation of this repository of its cultural tradition ?

" There is," writes Tocqueville, (it is 1840 not 1940) " no country in Europe so subdued by any single authority as not to contain citizens who are ready to protect the man who raises his voice in the cause of truth from the consequences of his hardihood. If he is unfortunate enough to live under an absolute government, the people is upon his side ; if he inhabits a free country, he may find a shelter behind the authority of the throne, if he require one. The aristocratic part of society supports him in some countries and the democracy in others. But in a nation where democratic institutions exist, organized like those of the United States, there is but one sole authority, one single element of strength and success, with nothing beyond it." To this political omnipotence of the majority was joined the moral omnipotence implicit in its institutions and fortifying its authority " for nothing is more characteristic of man than to recognize the superior sagacity of his oppressor." This problem of the tyranny of the majority and of the necessity of constant appeal to its prejudices remains the great problem of American government. Much

tention has been paid by writers like Laski to another danger that ocqueville foresaw, the growth of a new aristocracy of industrialists, rsher and less responsible than any history had known. But this nger has been met and conquered. The more abiding problems democracy remain.

I have concentrated on the passages where Tocqueville is at his ost sceptical and gloomy, because these are the most remarkable stimonies to his peculiar insight. But one must not forget that he ll believed that the Americans could overcome their problems, by e outer restraints of their particular institutions and the inner ones morality and religion. In a divided world his contrast between the merican and the Russian still holds good : " To attain his object e former relies on personal initiative and gives full scope, without ntrolling them, to the strength and rationality of individuals. ie latter in some sense concentrates in a single man all the power of ciety. The one has liberty as his principal means of action ; the ner, servitude."

he author is Reader in the Comparative Study of Institutions at the the University of Oxford.)

THE FRENCH ELECTIONS

By Philip M. Williams

BRITISH politicians are often reproached with living in the 1930's, and Americans with living in the 1860's. In France, as Dr. David Thomson pointed out in The Fortnightly*, the memories of 1789 are still potent. The twentieth century battle over the distribution of the national income goes on, far more bitterly than in Britain ; the nineteenth century struggle for parliamentary government remains undecided. But France is essentially a peasant country, and in the countryside the really important dividing line is still the eighteenth century quarrel between clericalism and free thought. Rarely far from the minds of politicians, it transcends in electoral importance the more familiar issues of the cost of living and the burden of rearmament, the losses of nationalized industries and the slow pace of house building, the size of the social security bill and even the prices of farm produce. The demand for subsidies to the Catholic schools estranges M.R.P. from the Socialists, despite their common faith in parliamentary democracy and their similar attitude to most social and industrial problems. It prevents any close alliance between two groups which have almost everything else in common—the Radical party and its allies, and the right-wing Independents and Peasants, both of them economic conservatives and political individualists, owing their strength to the personal influence of small-town and rural notables rather than to the power of modern mass organizations. It causes constant friction within General de Gaulle's Rassemblement du Peuple Français, the only movement which includes supporters drawn from both camps, and it would cause far more if the General were to come to power. In some areas, especially in the west, it is the only issue that really arouses passion, and everywhere it is of first-class importance. Only the rift separating the Communists from all the rest divides Frenchmen more deeply.

At the liberation, the political balance was distorted. The authoritarian Right was discredited by Vichy ; the Radicals and the moderate Conservatives were hampered both by their recent record and by their extreme individualism. Between them, these three groups held only a quarter of the seats in the National Assembly, the

* " The Origins of Modern France ", by David Thomson. The Fortnightly, June 1951.

ommunists and M.R.P. having rather more, the Socialists less. he lost votes of the Conservatives went to M.R.P., which seemed e strongest available bulwark against Communism. Yet even efore the election of the Assembly, when General de Gaulle came ut against the new constitution which M.R.P. was supporting, he as able to seduce two-thirds of the party's voters. And in the unicipal elections of October 1947, after he had assumed the adership of the R.P.F., he reduced M.R.P. from over a quarter to ss than a tenth of the total vote, while the new movement, with 5 per cent. leapt into the first place.

The Government parties faced an alarming prospect. The form f proportional representation used in 1945-1946 favours large arties, and might well give Communists and Gaullists together a ear majority of the new Assembly, which would make parliamentary overnment impossible. Yet to M.R.P., any electoral reform ould mean suicide, especially if it included a second ballot at which eir Radical and Socialist partners could make anti-clerical alliances gainst them. At the last moment, the prolonged deadlock was roken through the device of *apparentement*. As before, each epartment formed a constituency (the biggest being divided), each arty ran its own list, and there was only one ballot. But lists hich made a declaration of *apparentement*, or alliance, could add eir votes together and count them as a whole.* If any list or liance won an absolute majority of the votes cast, it took all the ats ; if not, P.R. was retained. And in any case within an liance, P.R. was used to allocate its seats to its several members. reater Paris, where the extremes are strongest, was exempted from e new régime, but a mathematical change in the method of allocating ats was introduced there, which assisted the weaker, that is, the overnment parties.†

It took months of pre-election wrangling before the majority arties agreed to this compromise, and meanwhile prices were rising pidly. It was not an impressive performance, and in the circum-ances it is surprising that they did so well. As in 1946, six million f the 25 million electors did not vote, or spoiled their papers ; they nged from the Calais centenarian who declared that women never oted in her day and she was not going to begin at her age, to the ine-growing village near Carcassonne which staged an electoral rike to protest against the low price of wine. The worst-hit parties ere those which predominated in 1946. M.R.P. lost 2,700,000 of

* Provided they belonged to an organization presenting lists in at least 30 departments. But this ovision could be evaded by running bogus lists, to bring the national total up to 30—for example, e U.D.S.R. list in Hautes-Pyrenées, which received six votes.

† It did so with such effect that one member was elected for Paris, although he had forfeited s deposit. This was M. Guérard, a right-wing Independent, whose list had 2.43 per cent. of the otes ; to save his deposit he needed five per cent.

their five million supporters, the Socialists 668,000 of their 3,500,000, and the Communists 450,000 of their 5,500,000. About two million votes were cast for the Radicals and their allies, and 2,500,000 for the right-wing Independents and Peasants—a loss of 200,000 for the former and a gain of only 35,000 for the latter, though both were contesting many more departments. The R.P.F., in its first general election, won second place, with four million votes. Yet recalling that the M.R.P. deserters of 1951 were already unfaithful in 1946 and 1947, the change is astonishingly small. Between the two Marxist parties on the one hand and the three mainly clerical groupings (including the R.P.F.) on the other, the shift of votes was little more than a million, and it was most marked in the parts of France where the hold of the Church, and the importance of the clerical issue, is weakest.

In votes, the democratic Left, Socialists and M.R.P., barely outnumbered the five million Communists, while the moderate conservatives of the " fourth force " held a lead of half a million over the four million Gaullists. But in seats, the moderates on each side are nearly twice as strong as the extremists. The six main groups are roughly equal.* The new electoral law did just what its authors intended, both by changing the way in which votes were cast, and by affecting the allocation of seats. Wherever the Government had a chance of winning an absolute majority, and so securing all the seats in the constituency, their spokesmen could and did argue effectively that a vote for General de Gaulle was a vote for the Communists. More important, however, was the second factor, which enabled the four moderate parties to win 94 extra seats, 69 of them at the expense of the Communists.† The Gaullists only lost 25 seats by the change, since where they chose they could usually make alliances ; in seven departments, in fact, they formed part of a winning coalition which secured all the seats. But in the other 32 constituencies where the pool was scooped, only the governmental parties benefited. Among them the Socialists did the least well, for they too had difficulty in making alliances‡. Wherever the clerical

* R.P.F. 118 ; Socialists 104 : Communists 103 : Right 98 : R.G.R. (mostly Radicals) 94 : M.R.P. 85. There are 24 overseas independents, many of whom will associate with one of the larger groups. One colonial seat remains to be filled in September.

† The same voting under the previous electoral system would have returned 172 Communists and 143 Gaullists—a clear, though bare majority of the 627 members. Compared with 1946, the R.P.F. and Right would have gained 104 seats from M.R.P. and four from the Socialists, who would have also lost two to the Communists and six to the Radicals.

Of the 94 seats won by changing the law, nine were secured by the new method of calculation in Paris, and 37 by the mere effect of *apparentement*—the combined votes of a coalition winning more seats than they would have done separately. Only half the gains (48 seats) were due to the absolute majority rule.

Luck was rather against the Government. With an extra 0.3% of the votes in every constituency they would have won 11 more seats ; to lose the same number, they would have had to lose ten times as many votes.

‡ They obtained 16 seats more than they would have done under the old system, compared with 23 extra for the Right, 26 for the Radicals and 29 for M.R.P.

ssue predominated, a combination of Socialists and M.R.P. was ikely to frighten Socialists into abstention and M.R.P. voters into Gaullism ; so in the west, along the eastern frontier and in the Cevennes, the Socialists usually fought alone.

The Government parties achieved their object, but at a high price n apparent unfairness. A party's representation might bear very ittle relation to its own strength ; for example, in the Hérault M. Jules Moch's Socialist list won three seats for less than 39,000 votes, while 69,000 Communists secured none. It bore still less relation to success or failure since the last election. The Radical Air Minister, M. Maroselli, increased his poll by 4,000, but lost his seat to a pro-Gaullist independent with less than half as many votes as himself. The Communists lost seats in two of the three departments where they did best, and the two most successful Socialists in the country were both beaten.*

Consequently, but not altogether fairly, the law has had a very bad press, both in France and here. *The Times* described it as a dangerous encouragement to election-rigging by others, as if this old French custom needed any more precedents than those of 1885, 1889 and 1919—to go no further back. Supporters of the British electoral system contrived to find something shocking in the French preference for a working majority rather than abstract justice. The Communists extolled the equity of the old system which in June 1946 gave them a seat for every 36,000 votes and the Radicals one for every 59,000, and denounced the iniquity of the new one, which gives the Radicals a seat for every 28,000 votes and the Communists one for every 52,000. General de Gaulle declared that the ordinary voter was disgusted by the dishonesty of the system, although the proportion of non-voters was exactly the same as in 1946, and no lower in the twelve departments where the old system was in force (because there were no *apparentements* at all) than it was elsewhere.† But there is a case for the law none the less. Given the complexity of French politics, a system which allows the voter to express two choices has its advantages ; over most of the country he can vote for the coalition (for parliamentary government against the extremes) and within the coalition, for the left or the right ; while in the areas where nothing matters but the Church schools, he can usually vote for a clerical alliance, and within it can opt for R.P.F. or M.R.P.

* One of them was M. Ramadier, the ex-Premier, who was opposed in the Aveyron by a M.R.P.-Radical-Right *apparentement*. When the Radicals realized that they were likely to defeat their old anti-clerical ally to put in a clerical, 70 of their local leaders actually issued an appeal to their supporters to vote for Ramadier, but it was too late.

† There were indeed fewer abstentions in Paris, where the new system did not apply : but so there were in 1946, when there was no difference between the Parisian and provincial systems. There were also more spoiled papers, 530,000 as against 360,000 five years ago. But this was probably due to the introduction of *panachage* (see penultimate footnote).

Moreover, the gap between electoral and parliamentary politics has long been a curse of French public life, and, since the parties of the centre are obliged to combine and compromise in the Assembly, there is a good deal to be said for a device which drives the fact home to their intransigent supporters in the country.

Among the local contests, the most interesting was that in Lyons, partly because " Paris is the capital of France, but Lyons is the capital of the Republic ", but also because of the personalities involved. The Government leader was M. Herriot, President of the Assembly (the Speaker), mayor of the town for nearly half a century (the Communists long ago christened him " *le discrédit lyonnais* "), the most determined opponent of Gaullism, and the Grand Old Man of the régime. His list was allied with the Socialists, headed by M. André Philip, with a local M.R.P. veteran named Guérin, and with a right-wing list led by M. Montel, a former vice-president of the parliamentary Gaullists who had not taken kindly to military discipline in politics. The R.P.F. leader was M. Soustelle, national secretary of the movement and now its chairman in the Assembly. At the head of the Communist list was the local party secretary, but its principal figure was his second, M. Pierre Cot, once a Radical Minister and now the ablest fellow-traveller in Europe, who had migrated from his unsafe former seat in Savoie. The two retiring Communist deputies had been moved down to third and fifth places to make room for this pair. Finally there was a dissident Radical, M. Chambaretaud, who waged an independent and entertaining campaign against the electoral law : " *Pour élire Guérin votez pour Herriot, pour élire Philip votez pour Montel, pour la prosperité votez pour les faillis, si vous êtes contents votez pour les sortants, mais pour du nouveau votez Chambaretaud.*" He only got 8,000 votes, but his intervention was decisive, for the Government coalition missed the absolute majority by 600. The four strongest lists, Communists, R.P.F., Radicals and Right, won two seats each—the R.P.F. gaining two and the Right one at the expense of M.R.P., which lost 40,000 votes and both its seats, and of M. Philip, who lost nearly half his votes and was beaten. French electors prefer a deputy who performs the local chores to one who achieves an international reputation at Strasbourg.

Despite their success in Lyons, the Gaullists were profoundly disappointed with the results of the election. In 1947 they had claimed six million votes, and really seemed to have united the right under one banner for the first time since 1870. But in the Seine, their 1947 vote of 650,000 was halved. In Toulouse and Bordeaux they lost a quarter of their strength, in Marseilles and Rennes a third, in Rouen 40 per cent., in Lille, Nantes and Grenoble nearly half. In St. Etienne they dropped from three-quarters of the total to one

quarter. These were serious losses for a mainly urban movement. Part of the trouble was their failure to enlist the whole-hearted support of big business, scared by the Gaullist talk of associating labour and capital, and by the risk of strikes if the General should come in. In Paris the R.P.F.'s losses since 1947 were much heavier in the *bourgeois* centre than in the working-class *banlieue*. In the second Nord constituency the Government owed their absolute majority to the support of a list backed by the big textile industrialists of Lille, Roubaix and Tourcoing ; it won only one seat, but it put in five Socialists (for 107,000 votes) and four M.R.P. (for 84,000), leaving 106,000 Communists and 94,000 Gaullists unrepresented.

The more serious weakness, however, is the resistance to political discipline of the Radical and right-wing *milieux* from which the R.P.F. draws most of its local leaders. There has been a steady trickle of resignations in protest against attempts to impose obedience either on the parliamentary or on the local level, and General de Gaulle's intransigence in refusing *apparentements* with potential allies produced another crop of defections during the campaign. It is true that alliances with every available Independent list would have only won him six more seats, at the price of diluting a parliamentary party which he would much prefer to keep pure. He will not soon forget the second chamber elections of 1948, when of 130 senators elected on the Gaullist ticket, less than 60 joined the parliamentary group. He has doubtless guarded against such a spectacular disintegration this time, but few French politicians are wholly immune to the temptations of office, and the R.P.F. has to manoeuvre on ground which is far more familiar to its opponents than to itself. Already M. Ramadier has pointed out that even if the Socialists went into opposition, only seven Gaullist votes would be needed to give the centre parties an absolute majority—and that at the price of seven ministerial posts these could no doubt be won over.

The Communist vote remains impressively stable. Of their 450,000 lost votes, nearly half were in the areas where the influence of the Church is strongest—29 north-western, eastern frontier and Cevennes departments which contain altogether only 27 per cent. of the electorate. This suggests that the damage has occurred at the fringe rather than at the core of the party's support. On the other hand, whereas in 1946 they were still making substantial gains in the working-class constituencies, in 1951 this was no longer true ; the main industrial departments contributed a little more than their proportionate share of the Communist losses.*

The Socialists, like the British Liberals, are ground between the stronger rivals on their flanks. Their 4,500,000 supporters

* The Nord, Pas-de-Calais, the Rhône, the Bouches-du-Rhône, the Paris suburbs, Seine-et-Oise and Seine-Inférieure have 21 per cent. of the electorate, but 24 per cent. of the Communist losses occurred in these departments.

of 1945 have dwindled almost by half. But whereas in 1945-1946 their losses were heavily concentrated in the working-class areas, the more recent losses have been much more evenly spread, being equally serious in industrial and in non-industrial, in Catholic and in non-Catholic regions. Communists and Socialists rarely lost votes to each other. There was nevertheless one important local variation in Socialist fortunes. In six of the eight departments in which they held their own or improved their position, the party was fighting alone, unencumbered (or unassisted) by Conservative or clerical associates. Shorn of most of its industrial following, the party has been thrown back upon the south as its territorial, and upon the rural schoolteachers as its social base. The election results show that it cannot afford to offend these determined enemies of clerical power, and the post-election delcarations of M. Guy Mollet show that the lesson has been learnt. But the Socialists remain where they have been for five years, in a position of responsibility without power. They fear to leave office lest they precipitate the clash of the extremes and destroy the régime ; yet they cannot affect policy except by provoking an occasional cabinet crisis, the result usually being a Government a little further to the right than its predecessor. The electoral verdict will strengthen the hand of the ex-Ministers, like MM. Depreux and Philip, who have long been urging the party to seek a "rest-cure in the opposition", against the present Ministers like MM. Moch and Mollet, who fear that the departure of the Socialists would leave the Government dependent on Gaullist support.

The long wrangle over the electoral law harmed the prestige of all the Government parties, but M.R.P. at least obtained compensation in the shape of a law inspired by them, and much less damaging to them than any likely alternative.* Their losses, though heavy, have been much smaller than seemed probable four years ago, and the party seems to have come to stay. Even for them, however, the new law has its drawbacks, for the cohesion on which they have prided themselves will be difficult to retain. Their national decline has increased the relative weight of the Catholic areas where they are most secure, and the alliance of M.R.P. with the Socialists, which formed the basis of the old majority, will be heavily strained now that nearly half the M.R.P. parliamentary group (37 out of 85) come from the departments where the clerical issue is decisive. Indeed, a quarter of their deputies were elected in alliance with the right and against the Socialists. A similar problem faces the right-wing Independents, 20 of whom had Gaullists among their election partners, while 34 had Socialists, and the remainder were opposed to both. Already at least a score of Independents have voted for the Gaullist who stood

* The law was originally proposed by two M.R.P. back-benchers sitting for precarious south-western seats : one, M. Roques, was beaten, but the other, M. Taillade, just saved his seat by means of *apparentement*.

gainst M. Herriot for the Presidency of the Assembly.

The Radicals, in the old days the party which specialized in con-radictory local alliances, have suffered (or benefited) less from them n this occasion ; three-quarters of their members ran in harness vith the other governmental parties. On the other hand, they and he right will suffer far more than M.R.P. from the personal rivalries vhich beset loose organizations. M. Daladier's hostility to M. Herriot, his former schoolteacher, goes back long before the war, nd when last year M. Daladier became president of the R.G.R. (a oose combination of parties in which the Radicals dominate) M. Herriot forthwith resigned his honorary presidency. Though M. Daladier has failed to persuade the Radical party to sink its dentity completely in the R.G.R., the "*guerre des deux Edouard*" s far from over. On the right the position is much more complex. P.R.L., which in 1946 hoped to become the Conservative party of France, has been disrupted by Gaullism, and has decided to merge nto the Independent group ; but the Peasant party (a splinter group rom the Cevennes with large ambitions) has refused to follow its xample, and the leadership of the remaining Independents is igorously disputed between their president, M. Reynaud, their ecretary, M. Duchet, and the ineligible but extremely active ex-remier, M. Flandin. In this sector of politics electoral and parlia-nentary behaviour are quite unrelated. Thus M. Daladier, leader f the anti-Government Radicals, formed an alliance in Vaucluse vith M.R.P. and Socialists ; but M. Antier, leader of the Peasant arty and a junior Minister, fought in Haute-Loire in partnership vith the R.P.F.*. M. Flandin is president of the *Alliance demo-ratique*, which forms part of the R.G.R. ; yet he himself has a right-ing past, and the secretary of his party stood as a right-wing ndependent.

Whatever semblance of organization these right-wing groups have —and it is little enough—has been forced on them by the system of arty lists. This system inevitably handicaps the genuine independent ven more severely than the wayward conservative. It is hard to get ound. In the Allier, indeed, a list of "*Concentration républicaine*" as formed by five members of the Theuil family, and got 6,400 votes. ess successful was M. Bougrain, former right-wing deputy for eine-et-Marne, who found only 32 supporters for his list of "*Courage ivique*", which included himself, his wife, and five old age pensioners. ven among the less freakish candidates, independents and dissidents

* The second on his list was M. Pébellier, an octogenarian retired haberdasher, who stood in ace of his son—a former deputy who was ineligible because he voted for Pétain in 1940. As the dest deputy, it fell to the father (who had never in his life been out of Le Puy) to preside at the first ssion. His pro-Pétain opening speech, written by the son, was an odd contrast to the opening peeches of the previous doyen, the veteran Communist Marcel Cachin.

did very badly. The rebel Communists of whom so much has bee made proved even weaker than the Trotskyists in 1946. Th " neutralists ", mostly former Socialists standing in Paris, we equally unsuccessful. And of the 22 deputies who had deserte M.R.P. since 1946, no less than 16 were beaten ; they include Gaullist leaders like M. Michelet, who stood against M. Queuille i the Corrèze, and M. Terrenoire who opposed M. Pleven in Côtes-d Nord, as well as the leftish rebels of the *Gauche indépendante*.*

Among the few successful Independents was M. Arthur Cont former secretary of the Socialist party in Pyrenées-Orientales, wh captured from his old party the last of the three seats which they onc monopolized. The confusion of the local Socialists had som excuse ; the official Socialist candidate and M. Conte were at onc opposing one another and allied in the same *apparentement*, the hea of the R.P.F. list was another ex-Socialist, and a vigorous campaig was being waged by M. Jean Rous, a left-wing rebel, on behalf of h candidature at the *next* election.

The general failure of independents reinforced one of the mai complaints against the previous electoral system, that lists were draw up by the party, and the elector could do nothing to affect the choic of individuals ; the behaviour of the Lyons Communists illustrate its validity.† An effort was made to meet the point in the new la and though it rarely worked at all, and then with perverse results gave some interesting pointers to the standing of individual leader M. Pleven and M. Moch, for example, receiving thousands of vot from outside the ranks of their own parties. On the other han several leading figures found themselves less popular than their mo obscure colleagues, among them M. Bidault and M. Pinay (th

* This unimportant but interesting group had three members, an abbé, a marquis and M Boulet, President of the Association of Mayors in the wine-growing Hérault, and a prominent lead in the fight against coca-cola. Near to them stood M. Lécrivain-Servoz, deputy for the Rhône, w had passed from M.R.P. into the R.P.F. and thence via the Overseas Independents (*sic*) into neutralis and M. Serre of Oran, who had been in turn M.R.P., Gaullist, right-wing Independent, pro-Radic Independent and neutralist, finally winding up in second place on the Communist list in the Do dogne.

† See earlier. Even under the old law, the voter might strike off his chosen list the name o candidate he disliked, and promote one he preferred. But as unaltered ballots counted as positi votes for the original list, this provision was wholly ineffective. The new law went much further, a allowed ' *panachage* ' ; that is, while still voting for a list, the elector could give a personal vote a candidate on a different list, to which a fraction of his vote would then be transferred. The resu could be surprising ; thus 7,000 votes given to M. Moch as an individual brought up the average his list enough to give it an extra seat, but he was safely in, and the benefit went to his number thr which the voters had certainly not intended. In Bas-Rhin and Seine-Inférieure, *panachage* has l to a complicated technical dispute over how to calculate the absolute majority, in which seven se are at stake. In Bordeaux, an ingenious ' motorists ' defence candidate founded his whole campai on *panachage*, urging everyone to ' *panache* ' in favour of two candidates on his list—then he wou win two seats and no one would be worse off. He only managed to convince the equivalent of 2,8 whole voters. Some parties used the names of national leaders like General de Gaulle, M. Herr or M. Pleven, though they were not candidates, to attract personal votes from other parties—they al attracted demands from their opponents that the election should be invalidated.

Minister responsible for housing) on the Government side,* M. Pierre de Gaulle, who was 3,000 votes behind his principal colleague, and even M. Thorez, whose name was actually struck out by 1,400 Communist voters in his Parisian stronghold.

The developments of the last 20 years have changed the political map of France remarkably little. The Government parties won an absolute majority of votes in 32 constituencies ; all but four of them were in the old republican zone south of the Loire. Conversely, while the R.P.F. reached a quarter of the votes in 22 northern departments, it did so in only four south of the river, and three of them were along the west coast—formerly a Bonapartist region. The traditional clerical areas of the north-west and north-east provided both R.P.F. and M.R.P. with two-thirds of their respective strongholds, though the former added the once Radical departments of the Paris basin, and the latter has established itself in a few scattered, usually mountainous parts of the south. The Socialist party comes more and more to resemble the old Radicals, as it takes over former Radical areas in inadequate compensation for its losses to the Communists. The Communists themselves are much the most widely distributed party, both geographically and socially. Weak only in the Catholic regions, they reached 40 per cent. of the total vote in three constituencies—on the one hand the north-western suburbs of Paris, and on the other two agricultural departments in the south, the Cotreze and the Creuse. The peasantry of these areas are voting not for the revolution of 1917 but for that of 1789. The party names change, but beneath the surface the electorate continues to assert the same preferences and prejudices ; the fundamental stability of French electoral politics is a phenomenon quite as remarkable as, though less remarked than, the kaleidoscopic changes of government. The country's tragedy is that it is a stability of equilibrium, not of harmony. In the new Assembly the parties which bid for working-class votes are almost exactly equal in number to those which appeal to a middle-class clientele. The clerical parties, relying on the curés, and their *laïque* opponents, dependent on the schoolteachers, are equally matched. No positive policy can emerge from this situation of stalemate ; but that is not the fault of the politicians, it is the result of the equal division of opinions. At least the contest will still be fought with words and not with bullets.

(*The author is a Fellow of Nuffield College in the University of Oxford.*)

* But despite the French loathing for taxation, the Finance Minister, M. Petsche, and his chief subordinate, M. Edgar Faure, both did very well, gaining respectively 15,000 and 6,000 votes more than in 1946. The latter was opposed by a Taxpayers' Defence list, but only 2,000 votes were cast against it; the French voter is fundamentally responsible.

THE SINGAPORE RIOTS

By C. Northcote Parkinson

FROM the middle of February to the middle of March this year three commissioners were hearing evidence concerning the disorders in Singapore on December 11-13, 1950. Now their Report is before the public* and perhaps deserves closer scrutiny than it is so far receiving in the British press. The commissioners the Rt. Hon. Sir Lionel Leach, Captain (now Sir Henry) Studdy and Mr. J. H. Wenham, sat in the Victoria Memorial Hall, a rather graceful classical building which dates back to the days of Sir Frank Swettenham and which almost adjoins the Supreme Court outside which the riots actually began. In a high roofed hall (and in a temperature of around 90°) the three commissioners on their dais faced a semi-circle of desks at which stood or sat both witnesses and counsel, each provided with a microphone. Behind these were a varying mainly European audience, who had passed the listless Malay police and taken their seats as if in church. The witnesses followed each other, police officials, soldiers and civilians, and the mass of documents accumulated. Periodically, military police would fetch or remove street-plans and maps pinned to screens. Occasionally some electrical failure would render question and answer equally inaudible. Reporters tip-toed in and out, the fans turned overhead, papers rustled and the Solicitor-General wrestled with his folders and typed sheets. Occasionally, a welcome breeze blows through the unglazed windows. Sometimes a bird flies in, circles in dismay and darts out again, followed by envious glances. The Commission adjourns until two o'clock and the onlookers pass out into the sunlight. A Malay policeman has his hands resting on his rifle muzzle, the thing which every recruit is taught not to do.

Onlooker impressions are not irrelevant to the Inquiry's purpose. One was of the straight, slightly sardonic look of Sir Stamford Raffles staring down from his portrait on the wall; another of the apparent worthlessness of the Malay police at the entrance and in the hall. There was the arrogant pose of Sir Frank Swettenham in the Sargent portrait ; but then he would not be much interested in the inquiry—a Federation Man, his gaze wanders northward towards Selangor or

* *Report of the Singapore Riots Inquiry Commission* 1951, *together with a Despatch from His Excellency the Governor of Singapore to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies.* Singapore. 1951. Crown Agents for the Colonies, Millbank, London. 4s. 8d.

Kelantan. Sir Stamford, by contrast, is interested but calmly superior to his successors ; if they had adhered closely to his ideas of town-planning, the riots would have been far more easily suppressed. Singapore, as re-founded by Raffles, would seem to have been an imitation of Malacca ; which was in itself perhaps an imitation of an earlier Singapore. The basic idea is a river mouth with a hill on the left bank and a single bridge leading to the flat ground opposite. On the hill you place your government buildings, your garrison, your palace. Round its slopes you group the houses of your officials and merchants. On the opposite bank you have your town, reached by that single and easily guarded bridge. On the side of the hill further from this bridge a secondary stream protects the administrative quarter on the other side and is crossed again at a single point. In a city so planned a riot in front of the Supreme Court is extremely unlikely and wholly avoidable. But Singapore, like Malacca, soon outgrew its original plan. The town sprawled here and there, ridges multiplied and suburbs spread, and the present lay-out does not lend itself to internal security. Government offices, police headquarters, official residences and radio station are scattered over a wide area and separated widely by the packed dwellings of a teeming population.

Security rests, therefore, on the police, and the police do not at first sight inspire confidence. This is partly because they are armed and partly because they are always staring into vacancy or grinning without comprehension when addressed. They have thus the air of soldiers off duty and arouse by their appearance the suspicion that they are an unhappy blend of the soldier and the policeman, too much of the soldier to sense trouble before it starts and too much of a civilian to deal with it after it has begun. Visual appearances, however, may well deceive, and the intelligent onlooker at the Inquiry was not in fact compelled to rely on them. If a Singapore resident, he had, besides, his own recollections of the riots, and now he and the public at large have the evidence analysed, summarized and used as a basis for certain conclusions. Even in this tabloid form the results run to nearly a hundred pages. If they could be still further compressed it would be, perhaps, in some such words as these : the Maria Hertogh case aroused feelings which the Government failed to assess and which led to riots the police did not anticipate ; the rioters gained confidence from the weakness of the police officers and the evident sympathy of the Malay constables ; the seriousness of the situation was not appreciated by the Acting Commissioner who at first refused military assistance ; thus many lives were lost and much damage done before the riots were suppressed (very competently) by the troops under Major-General Dunlop.

There can be no doubt that the Commission did its work thoroughly

and intelligently, and the Report is evidently the work of some ver shrewd minds. Sir Lionel Leach is, however, the last man to g beyond his terms of reference, and he wisely leaves his readers to dra their more general conclusions for themselves. Not all will think th same but most, perhaps, will be shocked, initially, at the irrelevanc of the whole affair. After all, South-East Asia, including Malay and Singapore is virtually in the battle-line between Chinese Com munism and all the forces which oppose it. In certain circumstance consequent on (say) a United Nations collapse in Korea, Malay might become a province of Communist China. Parts of Malaya ar already sufficiently in Communist hands to be unsafe for norma commerce and travel. It would need no vast scale of outside inte vention to make that occupation a firm reality. For Malaya an Singapore to fall into Chinese hands—as they so recently fell into th hands of the Japanese—would be a disaster to the British Commo wealth. But it would also be a disaster to Islam and especially t Indonesia. As against that major threat Malays and British should b united, and indeed to some extent they are. Singapore itself contain a considerable Communist party, normally more or less quiesce apart from its function of sending supplies and information to th bandits. This fairly passive rôle could be transformed at any tim into active revolt, ruinous to the Malays if successful. As seen again that background the spectacle of a religious riot, with Muslims attac ing innocent (and probably agnostic) Europeans in the name of Islan seems insanely pointless. More than that, it was suicidally foolis and might have been far more serious had the local Communists bee able to take advantage of it. In fact they were evidently as muc taken by surprise as were the police, but for which fact they might we have supplied the rioters with firearms. Had the Malay rioters bee so armed and had they gained an improbable triumph over th Government, they would ultimately have faced enslavement o extermination by the Chinese. There is something exasperating stupid about a revolt the success of which would have been mo disastrous to the instigators than its far more probable failure.

A more serious emergency should find a government better pr pared as a result of this first testing of the defences. What weakness did this affair reveal, and are they perhaps shared by other coloni which may be threatened in their turn ? The reader of this Repo who thinks on these lines cannot but be struck, first of all, by t position, as here revealed, of the Governor and Commander-in-Chi Singapore, like other British possessions, is supposed to be progressi steadily towards eventual self-government, either as a State in its or as part of Malaya. Some steps have been taken in this directi and the Governor has no doubt been instructed to play the part o constitutional monarch, aloof from controversy and immune fro

iticism. He is manifestly not expected or allowed to govern the olony as did former Governors of the Straits Settlements. To this ole Sir Franklin Gimson has adapted himself and governors elsewhere ave doubtless done the same. But the question arises as to whether is transformation may not be premature. During the period after ie Governor has ceased to be an autocrat and before any elected and esponsible cabinet has been formed, there would seem to be a real anger of there being no government. On the occasion of these riots Singapore, the police force was controlled by an acting Com- issioner who had assumed office shortly beforehand. An officer ith a comparable responsibility in England would not have had to ear it unaided. In London, at least, he would have had the Home ecretary's support and advice—and on at least one historic occasion home secretary was much in the forefront during an affair of far less nportance. In a provincial city there would have been a lord mayor the man ultimately responsible for order being maintained. But in ingapore the Police Commissioner, however recently appointed, eems to have to carry the whole burden. So far from being under ie Governor's orders he is responsible for the Governor's safety. for does the Colonial Secretary call for military help except at his equest. The reader of this Report cannot but wonder whether the ult does not lie more in the system than in any individual officer ppointed to work within its framework. A police officer is a civil rvant like any other and it is not the British custom to place a vil servant in the highest office, responsible only to the crown.

The Acting-Commissioner at Singapore seems to have had the mis- rtune of lacking not only an immediate superior but even an ffective deputy. The information which reached his radio control entre was, as one would expect, fragmentary, contradictory and ften inaccurate. With their Malay constables useless, his few uropean officers were too confused and shaken to give in every stance a precise account of what was happening. In such circum- ances, the Chief of the Police Force would naturally wish to see the ots for himself. But this was exactly what the Acting-Commissioner eems to have been unable to do ; apparently because there was no ne to take his place. This no doubt added again to a burden of esponsibility which was already too great.

Another impression which a reader might gain from this Report that the evil results of the Japanese occupation of Singapore are ill being felt and are likely to be felt for many years. Thus :

> One explanation of much of the lack of grasp and quick decision on the part of senior officers may lie in the fact that many of them were interned for over three and a half years during the Japanese occupation of Singapore. Such a long period of moral and physical strain cannot have failed to leave its mark on some of them.

he truth of this is manifest and the implications far-reaching. It is,

moreover, a question whether internment can have failed to leave its mark on *any* of those who were interned. It should be remembered in this connection that internment by the Japanese meant not merely confinement and starvation but the possibility at any time of torture and the likelihood of death. Had not Japan collapsed after the fall of the atom bomb and had the combined operation gone forward as planned for the recapture of Singapore, it can hardly be doubted that the Japanese would have killed all their prisoners in that area. The effect of internment however on the senior officers is only one aspect of the problem. For while the European officers were being thus publicly humiliated, some of their Asian subordinates were retained in office and thus became implicated in the Japanese police system. The removal of many (though not all) of these left the police force almost without experienced inspectors, and since 1945, when recruitment began again, such relatively high wages have been offered to rubber-tappers and other workers that the police force has attracted few men of the right kind. On the other hand, it must be remembered that the youths who took part in the riot had spent their boyhood under Japanese rule, learning nothing but hatred of Europeans and glorification of violence.

Readers of this Report will naturally turn with interest to the paragraph which describes what has been done since December 1950 to reform and strengthen the Singapore police. The measures enumerated include a further recruitment of Gurkhas and of special constables, the provision of more housing for the police, a reorganization of the radio control system and a new stress on riot drill in police training. These reforms, undertaken before ther Report appeared and already known to the Commission of Inquiry, necessarily exclude any of the remedies which are urged in the Report. Sir Lionel Leach and his two colleagues are not, it is true, primarily concerned with suggesting reforms. In paragraphs 114-140, however, they enumerate the " factors tending to lower morale and reduce efficiency in the police force " and so imply what should, in their opinion, be done. Beside the lack of housing, they point out the inadequacy of police pay, the overwork and excessive hours, the delay over settling pension claims, the shortage of gazetted officers and the " exaggerated emphasis " on the C.I.D. with its radio cars. They allude to the lack of day patrols, to over-departmentalism and to slowness of promotion, and they deplore the lack in Singapore of a mounted police. They mention with regret the fact that few Chinese will serve as uniformed policemen, although some will serve as detectives. They also stress the need for better liaison between police, public relations, and broadcasting departments—the need in fact for giving the public the news. Towards this object a useful first step, which they do not suggest, might be to make Radio Malaya as

ıdependent as the B.B.C. If there were any advantage in making a ıdio station a department of government—and the drawbacks are ımerous—it would seem to lie in the close liaison which might be ıaintained in a time of crisis. The fact that this liaison failed—ırough no fault of the radio staff—appears to remove the only ıstification for this anomaly.

The Report of the Commission shows, in effect, a sharp contrast etween the failure of the police and the swift success of the military. there was one person who enjoyed the Commission of Inquiry it ıust have been Major-General Dunlop. Among the police it was ıought that this contrast was heightened by the way in which the ıldiers had prepared their case and rehearsed their witnesses before ıe inquiry began. That they had in fact learnt a drill was manifest, artly from the smart way in which the military police answered uestions almost before they had been uttered, and partly because that the known army practice. But it is clear that the forethought hich went to prepare the troops for the witness box had been at ast as much in evidence in preparing them for possible riots. eneral Dunlop, General Officer Commanding Singapore Base istrict, had in fact no regular infantry at his disposal when the riots egan. There had been no infantry regularly stationed in Singapore nce 1948, the nearest battalions being those engaged against bandits ı Johore, the nearest State on the mainland. General Dunlop had ıerefore organized two composite battalions for internal security uties. These men were in fact the clerks and drivers, cooks and atmen employed in the base headquarters, supply dumps and orkshops. To criticism voiced in *The Times* and elsewhere that no perational troops were available, General Dunlop has replied that is composite battalions were in fact preferable. They had been ecially trained in the drill for aiding the civil power and used a inimum of force—whereas combat units might well have taken ction which would have bred hatred for generations. That the least ossible force was used is apparent from the return of ammunition xpended, which was apparently 20 rounds. It would however be nfair to conclude from this that a similar expenditure by the police ı the earlier stages of the affair would necessarily have quelled the isturbance. For the mere appearance of the troops had as much ffect, probably, as anything they actually did. They seem neverthe-ss, to have behaved extremely well, combining speed with restraint, esolution with humanity. The persons killed by the police and ilitary numbered only nine altogether, and the wounded numbered o more than 16, with 26 more injured by gas bomb splinters. That ıore Chinese were killed than Malays and almost as many wounded, proof perhaps that the innocent suffer—or more probably that a ot attracts hooligans, whatever the motives of those taking part.

As remarkable as the action of the composite battalions was the speed with which other units arrived from the mainland. Military help was first asked at 6.45 p.m. on December 11, the first internal security battalion arriving on the scene at 7.40 and onwards. But General Dunlop simultaneously (at 7.0 p.m.) asked help from his commander-in-chief, suggesting that two battalions of infantry and a squadron of armoured cars should be sent. Knowing that the units in Johore were deployed against the bandits, he expected little more than token assistance on the morning of the 12th. In fact a squadron of the 13/18 Hussars arrived before daybreak and were breaking up a riotous assembly soon after 7.30 a.m., while the other units sent began to arrive at first light on the 12th and were fully concentrated before noon. The command and the conduct of the military seem to have been exemplary throughout and General Dunlop's statement " as it is outstanding in character and may be helpful to Colonial Governments generally," is reproduced in full as an appendix to the Report. Paragraph 80 is of especial value as a suggestion for future use:

> In a further statement Major-General Dunlop indicated the useful purpose which helicopters could serve when dealing with rioters. In June 1950 he had arranged with the Air Officer Commanding Malaya that, in the event of the Military being called out in aid of the Civil Power, an R.A.F. helicopter would be allotted for his purposes, if a machine of this type was serviceable and available when required. He visualized that a helicopter would not only have a marked psychological effect by hovering, clattering and whirring close over the heads of rioters, but, with a military or police officer on board with tear gas grenades it would be a very effective instrument for the dispersal of such mobs, especially the rear sections of them. With radio contact with the ground it would also be invaluable for police or military reconnaissance purposes. At the request of Major-General Dunlop the Air Officer Commanding Malaya supplied a helicopter which landed on the football ground at Fort Canning at 1.10 p.m. on December 12. The pilot made several flights over the town area, with Police or Service officers on board, that afternoon and during daylight on December 13. On one occasion on December 12, Mr. Buckle, a police officer, dropped one tear gas grenade over a mob of about thirty rioters, who immediately dispersed.

When it is realized that General Dunlop foresaw the possible need for troops, improvised the infantry needed, mobilized them in ample time, used them (when requested) with speed, competence and humanity, and rendered afterwards a report outstanding in character and containing at least one valuable suggestion for the future, it may well be thought that his services demanded some recognition. So far, this recognition has taken the form of retirement from the active list on reaching the usual age limit for his rank. Perhaps, however, the publication of this Report will lead to recognition of a different kind.

(Dr. C. Northcote Parkinson is Raffles Professor of History in the University of Malaya, Singapore, and was there both at the time of the riots and of the Inquiry, several sessions of which he attended.)

SOVIET SATELLITE ARMIES IN EUROPE—1.

By K. M. Smogorzewski

STATESMEN and military leaders of the North Atlantic Treaty powers agree in estimating the Soviet land forces at some 175 active divisions, of which about 85 are stationed west of ıe Narva-Minsk-Kiev-Odessa line.* Of these latter, 22, including 3 armoured, are in eastern Germany, five are in Poland in military ıcampments around Bialogard and Legnica, two are in the Soviet ɔne of Austria, four are in Hungary in the Szombathely-Pecs-Szeged rea, three are in Rumania in the Timisoara-Craiova area, and 49 are ı the western parts of the Soviet Union. But any estimate of forces ı Europe available to Marshal Stalin must be misleading if it fails ɔ take into account the armies of Soviet satellites. That such forces lay an important part in Soviet strategy was amply indicated in .orea, and the technique of vicarious aggression used in Asia had ready been applied, albeit on a smaller scale, against Greece. It ɔuld again be brought to bear, on a larger scale, against, for example, ugoslavia. To know the strength of the Soviet satellite armies in urope is, therefore, of immediate importance.

In March 1951 the land forces of Poland, Czechoslovakia, umania, Hungary, Bulgaria and Albania together totalled 55 ivisions, which, however, varied as to the quality and efficiency f their command, training and equipment. The 16 Polish divisions, ɔr instance, are to-day in considerably better shape than the eight zechoslovak or eight Hungarian, while the 11 Bulgarian are superior ; a fighting force, and not merely numerically, to the nine Rumanian ivisions.

Not only does Moscow expect the satellite armies to be capable in a ear or so of giving a good account of themselves as combat units, ut it will also by then have increased the number of divisions to ɔout 80, including ten from eastern Germany. Judging by prepara-

* Mr. Emanuel Shinwell, the Minister of Defence, stated in the House of Commons on July 26, 1950, that the U.S.S.R. maintained an army " of some 175 active divisions, of which one-third are mechanized and tank divisions " (*Hansard*, vol. 478, col. 471). At Birmingham, on July 15, 1951, Mr. Woodrow Wyatt, Under-Secretary for War, said that the Russians had 215 divisions under arms. There is no contradiction between the two figures because Mr. Shinwell spoke only of " line " divisions, and Mr. Wyatt added to this figure the supporting 40 artillery and anti-aircraft divisions. At a press conference in London on July 27, 1951, Mr. Shinwell estimated the effectives of the Soviet armed forces at : army, including independent artillery division, 3,200,000 ; air force, including anti-aircraft defence, 800,000 ; navy 600,000 ; total 4,600,000. Not included in these figures are the forces of the interior which comprise 800,000 security troops and 600,000 frontier guards.

tions afoot in the satellite countries, by 1952 this number would include some 25 motorized, 15 mechanized and 16 armoured divisions.

It was at the beginning of 1949 that the Kremlin decided to use satellite armies in the event of war in Europe. On March 24, barely a fortnight before the signature of the North Atlantic treaty, it was publicly announced in Moscow that Marshal Aleksandr Mikhailovich Vasilevsky, a professional soldier, was to replace Marshal Nikolay Aleksandrovich Bulganin as minister of the armed forces of the Soviet Union. But at the same time a momentous secret decision was taken : Bulganin, a political marshal and a member of the Politburo of the All-Union Communist Party, was instructed to organize a special Bureau of Allied Armies.*

By this decision was concluded the first period of the Soviet Union's military collaboration with the European countries under its domination. It had been a period in which the existing armed forces had been subjected to great political purges, but in which also was set in motion a vast preparatory work of training a new officers' and n.c.o. corps under the supervision of Soviet military missions.

During this phase, the Kremlin was making use in the satellite countries of officers from the respective pre-war armies, the choice being made from among either naïve opportunists or indispensable technicians. With the beginning of the second period this type of command was discarded in favour of purely Communist leadership. Since 1950 a few " old " officers are still made use of as technical advisers or instructors in military schools, but only " new " officers are in command of units.

In the high command of the satellite armies two forms of control may be observed. In Poland and Bulgaria Soviet officers of Polish or Bulgarian origin are openly in command ; in Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Rumania " natives " remain ministers of national defence, commanders-in-chief and chiefs of staff ; in fact, however, these Communist leaders in generals' uniform are only figureheads and the real power rests in the hands of Russian commanders. During 1950 Soviet military regulations were introduced into all the satellite armies, which have also been re-organized on the Soviet model and equipped with the standard Soviet armament of 80 mm.and 120 mm. mortars, 76.2 mm. and 122 mm. howitzers and field guns, 152 mm. howitzers, 85 mm. anti-aircraft guns, T-34 tanks and T-42 self-propelled guns. In each of the six satellite States (the seventh, eastern Germany, is about two years behind) the armed forces are

* Since his appointment, Marshal Bulganin has many times visited Warsaw, Prague, Bucharest, Budapest and Sofia. Speaking at Sofia on September 8, 1949, he said: "The camp of democracy and socialism is immeasurably stronger than the camp of imperialistic reaction, and whatever our enemies may undertake, the future is with those who are loyal to Leninism, who persistently follow the teachings of Lenin and Stalin."

ivided into the army, the air force, the navy, the anti-aircraft defence nd the forces of the interior.

The army is composed of four types of division :

(a) Infantry division: three infantry regiments, one horse-drawn artillery regiment. Full strength, 11,000 men.

(b) Motorized division : three lorry-borne infantry regiments, one motorized artillery regiment. Same strength as foot infantry division.

(c) Mechanized division : two regiments of motorized infantry, one tank regiment and motorized artillery. Full strength, 8,500 men

(d) Armoured division : three tank regiments and self-propelled artillery. Full strength, 7,000 men and 270 tanks.

here are also typically-Soviet independent artillery divisions which, s in the Soviet army organization, are controlled directly by army eadquarters without intervening corps headquarters.

Even more characteristically Soviet are the forces of the interior ivided into frontier guards and security troops. These troops vhich in the Soviet Union form about a quarter of the total armed rces) are not intended for the front, although equipped in every ay, even down to tanks and aircraft, like front-line divisions. he satellite security troops are modelled precisely on the pattern f the Soviet M.V.D. and M.G.B. troops, whose rôle, unlike that of ie German S.S., is limited strictly to mounting guard over the régime nd repressing rebellion at home, including mutiny in the army. n the event of war they would move behind the armies in the field nd police the rear.

Compulsory military service is nothing new in the satellite countries; s duration was generally 18 months and recruits were conscripted at l. During 1950 the system was unified, first by extending the general eriod of service from 18 months to two years in the army, to three ears in the air force and the navy, and to 27 months in the forces f the interior ; and secondly by lowering the age of conscription om 21 to 20 years. By this procedure the units of all the satellite rmies since October 1950 consist of three age-groups. Everywhere, too, territorial army was introduced for age-groups which because of the nemy occupation of the respective countries or for any other reason id not serve at their proper time. Service in the territorial army is for our years and comprises four months of training in the first year nd two months in each of the remaining three years.

* * * * * * *

That the Polish army was " the spiritual child of the Soviet army ", atched over by Marshal Stalin with " paternal solicitude ", was the aim of Marshal Rokossowski speaking in Warsaw on October 12, 950, at the anniversary celebration of the day in 1943 when Polish nd Soviet soldiers shed their blood together at Lenino, west of Smo- nsk, in defence of " socialism, democracy and freedom ." From

1943 the intention was plain to read : (1) to destroy th 380,000-strong Polish Home Army, the only underground force i German-occupied Europe free from Communist influence ; (2) t make impossible the return in units of the 229,000 Poles fighting wit the Allies in the west, and (3) to use exclusively as cadres of the futur Polish army the eight divisions formed in Russia in 1943 which too part in the final Soviet offensive of 1944-1945. This triple aim wa fully achieved. Only 66,400 soldiers, with a small number of n.c.o' and officers, were authorized individually to return to Poland fro the west. At least 1,200 of them are at present in a concentratio camp near Hrubieszow. Among officers who returned, some receive a command for a time and were afterwards dismissed, some late succeeded in escaping to the west and some are in prison.

The first minister of national defence and commander-in-chief Brigadier Michal Zymierski, was promoted to marshal by Stalin In 1926 he was sentenced to five years' imprisonment for accepting bribes from businessmen while in charge of army supplies. Later posing as a victim of democratic convictions, he found his way t Moscow and was accepted there. The Kremlin had use for such a man during the interim period when some 1,500 Soviet officers of either Polish origin or having Polish aliases, were busy purging the cadres of the Polish army and instructing a new officers' corps These officers are known in Poland as *pelniacy obowiazki Polakow* or P.O.P's, meaning " those who take the place of Poles ."

On November 6, 1949, began the build-up of a new Polish army Brigadier Zymierski was dismissed and the Soviet marshal Konstantin Konstantinovich Rokossovsky, son of a half-Russified Pole was made Polish marshal and appointed minister of national defence and commander-in-chief of the Polish forces. On May 8, 1950, he was elected to the Politburo of the Polish United Workers' (Communist) Party, the real government of the Polish satrapy. Marshal Rokossowski dismissed many of Michal Zymierski's appointees and the high command of the Polish armed forces is composed exclusively of P.O.P's. They are :

First deputy minister of national defence and chief of staff : General W. Korczyc
Second deputy minister, commander of the land forces : General S. Poplawski
Inspector general of artillery : General W. Bewziuk ;
Inspector general of engineers : General J. Bordzilowski ;
Inspector general liaison troops : General R. Malinowski ;
Inspector General of armoured troops : General B. Mierzycan ;
Commander of the navy : Rear Admiral K. V. Cherokov.

On July 22, 1950, the new National Day—anniversary of the formation in 1944 of the first Soviet puppet government—a new army oath was introduced. Previously the Polish soldier swore " to defend the independence and territorial integrity of the Polish

epublic " and never to commit an act " contrary to Polish honour ", nding with the traditional formula " So help me God." The ldier of Marshal Rokossowski's army must swear to defend the eople's democracy " against imperialists " and fight for peace in line with the Soviet and other allied armies." For these tasks od's help is not thought necessary. In August 1950 Soviet military gulations were introduced in the Polish army and in October a niform vaguely similar to that of the Soviet army became compulsory; e traditional square cap was replaced by a round one.

In March 1951 the Polish army consisted of about 510,000 men and mprised 16 divisions, three independent artillery divisions, 12 tank giments, five engineer regiments, five liaison regiments and other chnical troops.* The order of battle was as follows :

Military Areas	*Commanders*	*Division*	*Headquarters*
I. Warsaw	General J. Rotkiewicz	1st Warsaw	3rd Lublin
		15th Olsztyn	18th Bialystok
II. Bydgoszcz	General B. Polturzycki	14th Bydgoszcz	8th Lodz
		12th Szczecin	16th Gdansk
III. Wroclaw	General W. Strazewski	10th Wroclaw	4th Kalisz
		5th Poznan	11th Jelenia Gora
IV. Cracow	General B. Kieniewicz	6th Cracow	2nd Kielce
		7th Zory	9th Rzeszow

our of these divisions were being transformed into motorized ivisions, four into mechanized, and four new armoured divisions ere in course of formation.

The air force at the beginning of 1951 was somewhat small and mprised three fighter regiments (or groups) equipped with the akovlev Yak-9, three light bomber regiments flying the Ilyushin -2, one regiment of medium bombers and one of transport. But the t-propelled fighters Lavochkin Lav-17 and Mikoyan-Gurevich Mig-15 were also to be seen in the Polish skies, which suggests that p-to-date *matériel* was forthcoming.

The Polish navy is insignificant and comprises only two destroyers *Burza* and *Blyskawica*), three old submarines, a few smaller craft and dozen motor torpedo boats. The forces of the interior include 12 rigades of frontier guards under Colonel N. Garbowski and 18 giments of the interior security corps under Major General David Schwarz-Hübner.

The political education of the armed forces is in the hands of General Marian Naszkiewicz, the third deputy minister of national efence, who was formerly ambassador to Moscow. Exponent of he typically totalitarian tenet that there is no lie too big to be believed rovided it is constantly repeated, he bases his propaganda on three

*This number was reported by Mr. C. L. Sulzberger in a dispatch dated from London in *The New York Times* of November 21, 1949. The *Orzel Bialy*, a London Polish weekly which counts General Wladyslaw Anders among its contributors, estimated in its issue of April 14, 1951, that the number of Polish divisions was " from 20 to 25 ".

main slogans : (1) Poland's independence was restored only becaus the Soviet Union was victorious ; (2) Poland's prosperity relies onl on the generosity and disinterestedness of Soviet help ; (3) wester imperialists want war and if they were victorious the outcome woul be a new German *Drang nach Osten*.*

* * * * *

That three years after the Communist *coup d'état* of February 194 there is still resistance to sovietization within the Czechoslovak army has been indicated by the admission in Prague of the arrests, on the grounds of conspiracy to prevent the re-organization of the army on the Soviet model, of General Bedrich Reicin, deputy minister o national defence, and General Zdenek Novak, commander of the Brno military area. The struggle to remould the army in the Soviet image began even before the liberation of the country. On April 18 1945, at Kosice, Slovakia, where the first post-war Czechoslovak Government was formed, President Edvard Benes signed a decree appointing General Sergej Ingr, former minister of national defence in the London government-in-exile, commander-in-chief of the Czechoslovak armed forces, and General Alois Liska, former commander of the Czechoslovak armoured brigade in Great Britain, chief of staff But these appointments were vetoed by the Kremlin and Benes had to sign a fresh decree nominating as minister of national defence General Ludvik Svoboda, commander of the Czechoslovak brigade formed in Russia, and as chief of staff General Bohumil Bocek-Chodsky, that is, two "Muscovites" instead of two "Londoners".

Prague's liberation on May 9 was by the armoured divisions of Marshal Ivan Stepanovich Konev only because the U.S. Third Army of General George S. Patton had been ordered to stop at Pilsen. On May 20, 1945, General Svoboda proclaimed in Prague that the new Czechoslovak army would be organized on the Soviet model, with Soviet regulations and equipment, In fact, however, until the Communist *coup d'état*, the Czechoslovak army was very far from being sovietized. The officers' corps remained attached to traditions and considered that, although political friendship with the Soviet Union was necessary, spiritually their country belonged to the western world.

In March 1948 began a thorough purge of the officers' corps. General Heliodor Pika, deputy chief of staff, arrested on a charge of spying and sentenced to death, was hanged on June 21, 1949, his true crime having been that, during the 1939-1945 war, as Czechoslovak military attaché in Moscow, he had warned President Benes to have no

* In a speech in Warsaw on July 21, 1951, at a celebration of the 7th anniversary of the "rebirth of Poland", Marshal Grigory K. Zhukov made an attempt at historical synthesis : "Many of those who were allegedly friends of the Polish people," he said, "forgot their obligations and failed to help you in your greatest need. Only the Soviet Union and its great leader Stalin gave the Polish people fraternal and disinterested assistance."

usions as to the future, for if Soviet influence was to predominate in ost-war Czechoslovakia there would be no hope of preserving the untry's free democratic institutions. General Bocek-Chodsky also me under suspicion of having pro-western sympathies and in the ring of 1949 was replaced as chief of staff by General Simon rgac. On April 25, 1950, General Svoboda himself, judged too eak by the Russians, was dismissed and President Klement Gottwald, ficially commander-in-chief, appointed his own son-in-law, Alexej epicka, minister of national defence. A " Muscovite ", General eicin, was appointed deputy minister and inspector general of the nd forces. General Drgac, chief of staff, publicly accused of anti-viet feelings by his fellow officer, Major General Jaroslav Prochazka, as dismissed on May 5, 1950, and was succeeded by his accuser.* n October 4 Gottwald promoted Cepicka and Prochazka to the rank army general.

Moscow knows well that these political officers are unable to rge the Czechoslovak army of its " Good Soldier Schweiks " whose ototypes flourished under Francis Joseph and who were familiar ements also under Thomas Masaryk and Benes. Only Russian ficers could eliminate such wreckers and form a force ready to e for Marshal Stalin. Colonel K. N. Ilinsky, head of the Soviet ilitary Mission in the time of General Svoboda, was recalled to oscow and replaced by Colonel General Nikolay Ivanovich Gusev. By the beginning of 1951 the organization of the Czechoslovak med forces was impressive enough. Their order of battle was as llows :

Military Areas	*Division Headquarters*	
I. Prague	5th Prague	13th Karlovy Vary
	11th Pilsen	1st Ceske Budejovice
II. Brno	3rd Kromeriz	7th Jicin
III. Bratislava	4th Zilina	9th Nitra

he Zilina division is motorized and that of Kromeriz armoured. vo new armoured divisions and two motorized divisions are in the urse of formation.† There are also 11 independent artillery

* Marshal Bulganin was present in Prague when all these changes occurred, but the official communiqué explained that his stay was connected with the celebration of the fifth anniversary "of the liberation of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Army from foreign occupation troops."

† The total of 12 divisions as the Soviet target for the peacetime footing of the Czechoslovak army was given to the present writer by an exiled Czech general. Marshal Konev, the " saviour of Prague ", was mentioned on January 9, 1951, in a report from Vienna to the United Press of America, as the real commander-in-chief of the Czechoslovak army. A Government spokesman in Prague described this report as " stupid ". Until January 1950, however, Marshal Konev lived either in the elegant residential Prague suburb of Dejvice or stayed at the health resort of Karlovy Vary and was again present in Prague on May 5, 1951, at the celebration of the sixth anniversary of the " liberation of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet army." In his speech he presented the most recent Soviet version of the Munich crisis : " In those critical days," said Marshal Konev, " the Soviet Union expressed readiness to render military assistance to Czechoslovakia. However, the Czechoslovak *bourgeoisie* then in power rejected the offer of the Soviet Union. It took the road of the national betrayal of its people, the road of ignominious capitulation before fascist Germany."

brigades and it is believed that the Russians intend to form four parachute regiments. The air force is said to comprise 3,500 modern aircraft. The forces of the interior include six brigades of frontier guards and nine regiments of national security troops. The total effectives of the armed forces are 250,000 men.

Since October 1, 1950, Soviet military regulations have been compulsory in the Czechoslovak forces and Army Day was proclaimed as October 6, the anniversary of the forcing of the Dukla Pass in 1944 by a Soviet army to which the Svoboda brigade was attached. On the 1950 anniversary Cepicka declared : " Never before have our military academies, schools and courses turned out such expert and able officers. Military discipline is being stiffened and military training strengthened to the utmost. The military qualities of our army continually improve." In December 1950 new uniforms, described by President Gottwald as being on the " glorious Soviet model ", were introduced into the army.

General Bohus Lastovicka, the third deputy minister of national defence, who was formerly ambassador to Moscow, heads the department of political education in the armed forces. His main propaganda lines are that Czechoslovakia was sold to German imperialism by western powers, that its independence was restored only by the Soviet victory and that its survival is possible only through the closest political, economic and military collaboration with the Soviet Union.

(*The second part of the article will be published in the October issue of* THE FORTNIGHTLY. *The author was the founder and editor of* FREE EUROPE.)

TOWARDS WORLD GOVERNMENT

By Gilbert McAllister, M.P.

OF what use is science if man does not survive ? " asked H.R.H. The Duke of Edinburgh in his address to the British Association last month. Sir Henry Dale, O.M., in an article in the *ectator* a few days earlier, reviewing the report by Japanese writers the effects of the atom bomb which fell on Nagasaki, had given pressive emphasis to the same point of view. Nero playing a enade to burning Rome represents sanity itself compared with the naviour of world statesmen on both sides of the Iron Curtain in e face of the imminent danger of atom and hydrogen bombing and cteriological warfare. Sir George Thomson, possibly the greatest pert on atomic physics in Britain to-day, has said that one hydrogen mb, successfully detonated, might be sufficient to wipe out all man life on this planet. He concluded that the United States ould, therefore, solemnly declare that in no circumstances would e use the hydrogen bomb *unless an enemy had used one first.*

When that morning in 1945 the Americans dropped the first atom mb on Nagasaki the world was filled with horror and wonder, t mankind it seems has little capacity for maintaining an attitude rational fear or indeed of rational hope for any length of time. The an in the street turns with a shrug to his football pools, to the test atches; the politician, to price control, to the irreproachable glories private enterprise or the equally irreproachable efficiency of State wnership and control. And because public and politicians love circuses always a convenient substitute for an adequate diet whether of the dy or of the mind—in the United States they stage the Committee Un-American Activities, while we, always more modest in these atters, content ourselves with the dismissal of a chairman of a new wn or a few civil servants.

Gradually, Nagasaki and Hiroshima sink into their proper place in orld history—a nine days wonder at the best. It is discovered by d by that the atom bomb is, after all, merely an extension of those ethods of warfare which have been employed by every nation since ichael Schwartz of Brunswick in 1320 invented gunpowder. here is nothing specially immoral about it ; no more people were lled at Nagasaki and at Hiroshima than were equally effectively stroyed by the joint concentration raids by the R.A.F. and the S. Air Force during the war. It can, in fact, be worked out as a

simple arithmetical table. Between 1939 and 1945, 60,000 men women and children were killed in the United Kingdom as a result of enemy air raids. In one night in Hamburg 60,000 men, women and children were killed as a result of a joint raid by the British and the Americans. In one split second at Nagasaki, 60,000 men, women and children died, leaving no trace of their existence on this earth save the shadow of one man which remained on a wall when its owner disappeared—quite simply—into the kindly infinite. It is true, of course, that the modern atomic bomb is some ten to twenty times as powerful as the primitive mechanism which fell on the Japanese six years ago. Ten times sixty thousand is 600,000, twenty times sixty thousand is 1,200,000—about the population of Birmingham or Glasgow. The experts are right ; the atom bomb is merely an extension of the ordinary methods of warfare. Dr. Fisher, the Archbishop of Canterbury himself has said that in his view the atom bomb has made no change in the nature of warfare except in the degree of its destructiveness.

It is, however, good science as well as obvious common sense that a quantitive change sometimes becomes a qualitative one. It would be arguable that the atomic bomb has so changed the quantitive nature of war as to completely alter its character. If there was the slightest difficulty in sustaining that argument, the hydrogen bomb abundantly proves the proposition. The United States of America, which has already spent a fabulous sum since 1945 on atomic development alone is also committed to vast expenditure on hydrogen bomb development in South Carolina. What and how much the Russians are doing about atomic and hydrogen bombs is not known, but that they are not uninterested is proved by every incident from Dr. Allan Nunn May and the Canadian spy trials to the disappearance of Mr. Pontecorvo in the early summer of this year. A few weeks ago three American eight-engined bombers flew low over London, sombrely reminiscent of the silent flight over London before the outbreak of the 1939 war by the massed 'planes of the French Air Force. These American bombers can take off from American bases, fly to the most distant part of the world and return to their home bases, between sun-up and sun-down, without refuelling. On the bacteriological side of warfare we have Lord Boyd Orr's word for it that this delightful science has so far progressed that, with less equipment than is possessed by the average county M.O.H., an enemy country could kill off the entire cattle population of the United Kingdom within one week. It is the stark literal truth of our time that whatever nations are involved in the third world war, there will, in the end, be neither victors nor vanquished but possibly mankind annihilated, sacrificed on the altar of national sovereignty ; or, at the best, there will be little handfuls of human survivors starting to

build all that we know as civilization from the point where man left f five thousand years ago. " I cannot tell ", said the expert, " what eapons man will use in the next world war—but in the war after at both sides will use bows and arrows."

The threat of war is urgent, not specially to the British, nor the mericans, nor the Russians, but to all mankind. There is another reat : of world starvation. In India, in Pakistan, in Africa, we have ready seen famine this year. Hundreds of thousands of human ings, subject to the same physical needs, the same emotional arnings, the same hopes and fears as you or I, died this year, their ces and their bellies twisted in the agonies of hunger. I have only ice seen famine in my life and I will vouch for it that it is not a pretty ectacle. There are millions of Indians for whom the rice ration has en reduced from 12 ounces (the minimum necessary to maintain life expectation of 26 years) to nine ounces. And in China, ho knows ? It is certain that in that vast country, bigger than the hole European continent, where in times of peace famine was a current affair, the problem must have been enormously accentuated the wars which have torn the country since the Japanese, always ateful to Lord Simon, started the " incident " which has occupied e time and substance of the whole nation for 20 stricken years, rough all the *divertissements* of Chang-Kai-Shek and Mao Tse.

If a century from now there are any people to write history and any eople to read it, no one will be able to understand why the west, in e years immediately succeeding the 1939-1945 war, failed so mpletely to understand the east. We fob ourselves off with cuses. We even congratulate ourselves on giving certain sections the east self-government. The Indian people are beginning to be nscious that getting rid of the British Raj did not fill any empty omachs and, of course, that should have been apparent even to the itish Raj. The fact is that in the Indian sub-continent, since but ot because of self-government, starvation and hunger have increased hile the conferring of national sovereignty on the Pakistans and the dians has brought these two nations near to fratricidal war.

It is almost as if the west had no faith and no belief. We talk deed of democracy, but that, like patriotism, is not enough. emocracy is neither a faith nor something which can at all times and all climates be transplanted overseas ; we are a little arrogant when e imagine that the political institution which we have built up and hich on the whole serves us well, and in whose fundamental prin- ples we all believe, is necessarily the best system for other countries nd other peoples. But faith is a different matter ; we are officially a hristian people, and whether or not most people in Britain to-day ould even claim to be Christian, the Christian faith, the Christian hic and the ancient prophecies of the Psalms and liturgies of the

Jews influence us more than we know. How much do we really believe ? " I believe," does not mean, " I imagine," " I think ", " I suppose ", or " I have an idea that " ; " I believe " means " I live by the knowledge " of something. In the west we profess a belief in the things that Jesus taught. He had in common with all the great spiritual leaders of the world a belief in the necessity for a mature, unselfish attitude to one's neighbour and a love of God. "He prayeth best who loveth best all things both great and small ", said Coleridge ; Buddha said : " When a man has pity on all living creatures then he is noble ". In a century which has seen more diabolical cruelty practised on more human beings than in any previous period of history, the very wells of pity tend to dry up. We are like terrified children who pull the bed-clothes over our head. We ignore the two-fold challenge of our time, war and hunger, and pretend (while betraying the deepest beliefs and the faith of our Christian inheritance) that the methods man has practised throughout the centuries will, somehow, this time, succeed.

Imagine that you are not an Englishman, a Scotsman, a Welshman, an Irishman or a citizen of that great country, the United States of America, but instead a Chinaman in his paddy field, a Pakistan in Karachi, an Indian in Bombay or Calcutta or an African in the Bush. A Christian missionary has told you of the faith by which man lives in the prosperous west ; by some miracle of British beneficence perhaps you have learned to read ; you know a little of what is going on in the world ; you know that many of your fellow countrymen are starving, and you look to the west to see how the application of Christian principles bears upon world events. You see the United States committed to a rearmament programme of £21,000,000,000 ; you see the United Kingdom pledged to a rearmament programme of £4,700,000,000. In Britain, Ministers are harping on the need to reduce civilian consumption ; in the United States they declare that they can have all this and butter too. You have heard of the Colombo Conference and see that the expenditure of £900,000,000 involved in this plan is no longer possible because of rearmament. You have heard of President Truman's Point Four, and see that it has become, however sincerely intentioned, merely one of the paper promises which litter the highways of man on the road to disaster. And, if you, like the Japanese Roman Catholic survivors of Nagasaki, can square all this with Christianity it merely proves that sometimes those who loll at the feet of Gamaliel turn wiser than the teacher.

Never mind what the Russians are doing. It is not relevant, if one is not leading a Christian life oneself, to excuse it by the fact that other people are leading even less Christian lives. We are the inheritors of the Christian tradition with all that that implies, of love and charity, of faith and hope. What is it that stands in the way of the removal of

e fear of the threat and the actuality of war from the hearts and the inds of man ? If we could devote one half of the wealth that we e now devoting to rearmament to the feeding of the world's hunger e economic lot of man in our own country and everywhere else would e raised at once to a level of well being and prosperity hitherto nknown. Even if we were only to devote five per cent. of our ational wealth to the feeding of the poor in Africa, Asia and else-here, their lot would be infinitely happier. We cling tenaciously to e idea of national sovereignty. We are loth to part with a particle it and yet quite clearly it is the idea and the reality of national overeignty which has made war a recurrent phenomenon all through story and which may yet bring mankind to destruction.

This would be a picture of a gloom so impenetrable that one could most reach out one's hand and touch the darkness—hard and solid, ke the fog that surrounded Conrad's first ship on its way to Bangkok -were it not for the fact that the greatest leaders of mankind in the orld to-day are all acutely aware of the problem and all unanimous their answers. His Holiness the Pope speaking to members of the Vorld Movement for World Federal Government at Rome on April 6 is year, said : " You have the task of creating an effective political rganization of the world . . . an organization of this nature must, herefore, be set up, even if only to end the competitive rearming of ations, through which, for decades past, peoples have ruined them-lves and exhausted themselves in complete waste." Dr. Garbett, e Archbishop of York, the most modern minded of ecclesiastics id a month later : " The world has to make the choice between ternational anarchy or international law ; but law will be flouted nless behind it there is authority strong enough to enforce it against ggressor nations. Christians of all Churches should support the onception of a world order and practical steps towards its realization, r it is the Will of God that nations, as well as individuals, should ve in fellowship as members of one family under His Fatherhood." andit Nehru said : " I have no doubt in my mind that world overnment must and will come, for there is no other remedy for the orld's sickness." President Truman recalled to his fellow country-en the situation of his own country in 1766, when there were 13 parate colonies scattered along the Atlantic coast. The whole orld, he argued, is now in the same position. " We must recognize," id the President, " that the march of events has joined the peoples of e world together in a common destiny whether they like it or not." nthony Eden said in the House of Commons in the Korean debate : The only alternative to war or international anarchy is the establish-ent of the rule of law . . . Unless we can establish the rule of law nd respect for that rule, it is impossible to find any basis for lasting eace." Clement Davies speaking in the same debate said : " For

many years I have desired a world government. I am perfectly sure we shall never get permanent peace until all of us are prepared to surrender part of our sovereignty and have an international body that will lay down the laws all of us shall obey." Winston Churchill, speaking in Copenhagen a few months later said : " The creation of a co-operative all-powerful world order is the ultimate end towards which we must strive. Unless some effective world super-government can be set up and brought quickly into action, the prospects for peace and human progress are dark and doubtful." That is the simple and sober truth which world statesmen will continue to ignore at peril to themselves and to the whole of mankind.

Among the peoples there is no doubt they would have world government if they could. It has been the aspiration of man for thousands of years. In the last two hundred, nationalism has been increasing until at last it reached, with the Nazis in Germany, the point of complete paranoia. Yet whether it was Robert Burns in Scotland prophesying

> For a' that and a' that,
> It's comin' yet, for a' that,
> That man to man the world o'er
> Shall brothers be, for a' that.

or Tennyson in England—half a century before the Wright brothers—

> Till the war-drum throbb'd no longer,
> and the battle-flags were furl'd
> In the Parliament of man, the Federation
> of the world.

the hope was kept alive in the darkest disasters of nationalist folly.

Since 1945 mankind has taken certain tentative steps towards greater union ; the Hague conference which I and a number of Labour colleagues attended—despite official party frowns—gave rise to Strasbourg. In the United States, in Canada, in the United Kingdom, the idea of Atlantic union finds growing support. But, as we grope towards European union or English-speaking union we are obsessed with the difficulties, with the things that divide us, and still fail to grapple with the central problem of our times. Britain should give the lead. Apart from Iceland we are the oldest democracy in the world ; we are still, when all is said and done, the most mature people in the world and, although we are ashamed to admit it, the kindliest. The world will remember Dunkirk, the Beveridge Plan, the British Commonwealth and its free nations when all our Amritsars are forgotten. Europe, the Atlantic peoples and the peoples of Asia alike await the leadership that only Britain can give. If *our* Prime Minister, if *our* Foreign Secretary would have the courage to put boldly before all nations a plan for a world authority, a plan to combat the world's hunger, a plan to end the gigantic waste

human energy represented by rearmament, the world would listen d respond. At this crisis in the affairs of man I cannot believe that itish statesmanship will fail—it is not the wish of the British people at it should fail.

For this reason, more than usual importance attaches to the rliamentary conference on world government to be held this onth in London,* under the auspices of the Parliamentary Associa- n for World Government of which Mr. Clement Davies is President, d the Parliamentary Group for World Government of which Lord yd-Orr is President, and which has the support of peers, M.P's and any more distinguished in industry, in literature in the arts, in peace d in war. This will be attended by Members of Parliament from over the world. The United States Congress and Senate will be presented ; so, too, will Canada, South Africa, New Zealand, ustralia and Pakistan. India is trying to send a delegation but ogress is difficult because of the forthcoming full-suffrage elections d of the internal crisis of the Congress party. General Riiser rsen, who commanded the free Norwegian forces during the war, heading the Norwegian delegation. Professor Hans Thirring of ustria, one of the greatest physicists in the world to-day, whose me is especially associated with hydrogen bomb research, will be ere to plead that man may find an escape from insensate folly. veden, Denmark, Holland, France, Italy, Belgium, Brazil, Germany, banon and Switzerland will be represented. Yugoslavia is sending delegation of 13 Members of Parliament. From the British est Indies Mr. D. B. Sangster, Minister of Social Welfare, Jamaica, ll be there to speak for the growing political consciousness of the lonial peoples. Lord Boyd Orr, Lord Beveridge, Mr. Clement avies, and Henry Usborne, M.P., together with some 20 of his lleagues from the United Kingdom Parliament, Mr. J. B. Priestley, r. Lionel Curtis, Sir Montague Burton, Mr. Frank Parkinson, r Alfred Suenson-Taylor, Lord Silkin and many others form an pressive British team.†

The Conference will open in Church House, Westminster, adding a rther page of history to the most historic of London's recent ildings, for during the war it served as the House of Commons and terwards for the United Nations itself. Mr. Henry Usborne and I ll move a resolution in the following terms :

Whereas while adhering to their own ways of life, all men desire earnestly to live together in peace with justice,

And whereas peace depends in any community on the prevention of violence by the effective administration of laws, and justice requires that these be laws consented

* September 24-29.

† The conference will have a considerable social side to its activities, culminating in a reception the Lord Mayor at the Mansion House. Great public meetings will also be held in Cardiff, Glasgow d Edinburgh and in London itself.

to, directly or indirectly, by the members of that community,
And whereas the world community of mankind still lacks a system of governmer which can thus guarantee peace and justice to all and yet preserve national autonom in matters of domestic concern,
And whereas such a system of world government requires the delegation of certai prerogatives of national sovereignty to a supra-national organization,
Be it therefore resolved that all peoples desirous of creating or joining such system should be willing to grant the following legislative, judicial, and executiv functions, respectively, to appropriately constituted authorities, in accordance wit an amendable constitution freely adopted, and under the supervision of a suprem court.

1. The progressive codification of the existing body of international law, an the enactment of such new laws as shall be necessary for the interests of the worl community and permitted by the new constitution, in particular
   i. For controlling the manufacture and distribution of weapons of mass destruction, an limiting the size of national militias ;
   ii. For developing the social and economic organizations now maintained by the U.N. i order to raise standards of living throughout the world ; and
   iii. For laying taxes, and budgeting for supra-national expenditure ;
2. The judicial settlement of international disputes by courts in accordance wit law ; and
3. The maintenance and disposal of a secretariat, inspectorate, supply services, and armed forces, which shall, under oath of allegiance to the supreme court, secure the execution of supra-national laws, and ensure in particular
   i. That all international disputes and suspected transgressions of law are referred peacefull to jurisdiction ; and
   ii. That all decisions of courts are put into effect by the individuals, organizations, an governments concerned.

Two days of the debate will be given to the discussion initiated by Sir Richard Acland, M.P., and Mr. Leslie Hale, M.P., on the "Freedom from Want" resolution.

That in the opinion of this Conference the urgent positive task of mankind is to make a concerted world effort to raise the quality of living of all peoples in under-developed countries and to eliminate illiteracy, squalor, hunger, malnutrition and preventable disease from their lives ; it therefore calls on the governments of the powers to confer, as a matter of urgency, with a view to establishing a World Development Authority to undertake this task.

It is difficult to estimate the effect that this conference will have on future history but it may very well be that just as the unofficial Hague Conference seized men and women all over Europe with the idea of the practicability of European Union, so the London Parliamentary Conference on World Government may light the way out of the present darkness for the peoples of the world.

(*Mr. Gilbert McAllister, Labour Member of Parliament for Rutherglen, is Chairman of the British All-party Parliamentary Association for World Government.*)

THE ROAD TO MUNICH 1938

By Owen Tweedy

NOT normally such a long time in a man's life, it is 13 years ago since " Munich ". In September 1938 I was an officer of the Palestine Mandatory Government and after two and half anxious years of almost unbroken Arab violence I was due for eave. Government regulations authorized a travelling allowance f, I think, £35 to cover the cost of the sea voyage home from Port Said r Alexandria. This was the way most of my colleagues went. But had other ideas. I wanted to fly home across Europe ; and, with ome difficulty I got Government permission to put my travelling llowance towards an air passage which I would negotiate myself.

First I applied to Imperial Airways : £46 and no reduced fares. Then to K.L.M. : same answer. That was no good to me so, none oo hopefully, I tried Air France and they did offer a summer reduction—£40 to London. This spurred me to remember that there were till two heavily subsidized national air concerns with offices in erusalem. So I temporized with the French and continued my round o the Italians. They received me with open arms ; for their *lla Littoria* got very few passengers. After verifying who I was, the nanager retired behind a glass screen and re-appeared two minutes ater with an offer of £35 including a day's free sight-seeing in Rome t the mercy of the Fascist Tourist Association. But this stank so of Mussolini and propaganda that I withdrew and hied me to the last n my list. The Polish " Lot " company made no bones about nything. They, too, got very few passengers, so : " What would pay ? " This was grand. " £25 " I said. There was another uddle behind another glass screen and then : " They couldn't quite nanage that ; but would I go up to £26 10s. ? " I accepted on the ail and told them to send the bill to the Palestine Government who vere thus saved £8 10s.

A week later I was away. In those long-ago days of 1938, what vith sabotage and sniping and ambushes, the road from Jerusalem lown to the Lydda airport was unsafe for any but Arab drivers—nd none too safe for them. But all went well until just before we ot to the airport, when with a loud bang followed by a huge column f smoke, up went Lydda railway station near by. It was my *envoi* rom Palestine 1938.

The Polish 'plane—a lovely Lockheed—was empty save for myself

and a bag or two of mail. We touched down at Rhodes ; luncheo at Athens ; had tea at Salonika and, after a customs halt at Czernowitz, reached Bukarest at sunset. There—included in my fare !—was a free night in a fine hotel with good food and a good bed and—to show me the town—a Jewish taxi-driver who spoke German bu had no passport and no nationality and longed for Palestine.

Next morning we got to Warsaw. For me it was out of th Palestine frying-pan into the Polish fire. For no sooner was comfortably established in the *Europaischer Hof* than an excite valet in execrable French started talking war. " War with whom ?" I asked. " Czechoslovakia," he replied. " Unless, of course, the give us Teschen." For that very morning Lord Runciman's repor that the Sudetenland should be German, not Czechoslovakian, ha been published. And the Poles, whose past history has taught them the gymnastics of land-grabbing, were losing no time in staking ou their claim to their *terra irredenta*. And, to my surprise, I found tha those Poles with whom I talked took it for granted that we woul back them. Had not the Runciman Mission—our Mission—handed the Sudetenland back to Hitler on a plate ? And we loathed Hitler And the Poles only wanted Teschen. And we loved the Poles. Wa Lord Runciman coming to Warsaw to arbitrate the Teschen case ? All this made me feel quite sick—and apprehensive too. So much so indeed that next morning I went to the " Lot " office to try and exchange my Warsaw-Berlin-London air ticket for one round by Helsinki, Stockholm and Copenhagen. But Warsaw wasn't Jerusalem and there was nothing doing except at a cost far beyond my purse.

Two days later I left the Polish capital for Berlin. It was a horrid departure. Passports were impounded for an hour. Luggage was turned inside out. Some passengers were searched down to their underclothes. It was mysterious and rather frightening and I got a bit jumpy. And the flight itself made me no better. For we zig zagged like a woodcock to avoid—as we passengers whispered to each other—flying over military zones where warlike preparations were doubtless afoot. Indeed by the end of the journey I was almost seeing things.

But to my surprise and relief Berlin was quite normal. I was met at Tempelhof aerodrome by one of the staff of the Deutsche Nachrichten Bureau—the D.N.B. which corresponds roughly with our Reuters. My Palestine job had brought me into close—and sometimes acrimonious—touch with their Jerusalem representative whose telegrams needed a lot of watching and he had put his head office on to me. The chief man was away but his deputy couldn't have been more hospitable. He deposited me at the *Kaiserhof* just opposite Hitler's Chancellery, and later took me out on the *bummel*. It was a most ingenious evening. We had our dinner in

ree different restaurants. Fish in one with lovely Rhine wine ; e meat course in another with a warmer wine; then fruit, coffee and queurs in a third with a cabaret thrown in. But I weathered the rdeal all right and—a bit flushed maybe—was back at the *Kaiserhof* bout midnight. There the D.N.B. chief was waiting to greet me. e had been a U-Boat Commander and was very proud of his service ast—and future. " To-day," he said, " we have again a German rmy and a German Air Force and "—with much emphasis—" a erman Navy." From that we drifted to Czechoslovakia. The dignities committed on the Sudeten Germans ! It was intolerable. idn't I think Lord Runciman was quite right ? This torrent of ropaganda saved me from talking myself which I didn't mind at all. t that hour listening was far easier. And at 2 a.m. he, too, lapsed to silence—rather a depressed silence. We rose to go and his arting words made me wonder whether he was quite as confident as e appeared to be. " Tell me " he said; " if Hitler insists on getting ack Sudetenland, what will England say ? "

Next day I pottered, but uncomfortably. There were too many ags ; too many Nazi uniforms, and, in the shop windows along nter den Linden and in the other main streets off it, too many rand-new maps of vast size showing Sudetenland within the very eshly painted red frontiers of the Reich. And everyone was gazing t them and in the cafés everyone was reading papers full of Hitler's oming speech at the Nuremberg rally.

That evening I dined with the D.N.B. chief. He took me to a rious restaurant overlooking the sports stadium where two years efore the Olympic Games had been held. After the *Kaiserhof* it was a etter place for ordinary talk and over a very good dinner my host laxed with a lot of stories of Tirpitz and of the famous " *spurlos rsenkt* " order. No regular German U-Boat officers, he told me, ad liked it, and what they had dreaded most of all were the " Q " oats and the depth charges. He had a terrific admiration for the ritish Navy. The Battle of Jutland—he called it the battle of the orn Reef—had turned the war on the sea against Germany for all me. Then he passed to Kiel and 1918 and the naval mutiny. It ad been awful. He and his brother officers had gone in danger of eir very lives and they had remained pretty well down and out until itler came. He had put them back into the German picture. I ked him about Hitler. He was very cautious. A great man, he id, the man Germany wanted, the man of destiny—*der Schicksals-ensch*. We were looking out towards the dark and empty stadium. But he has a very violent temper. You should have seen his face the Games here when an American Negro won so many events ! e loathes the Jews ; but Negroes were only cattle to him." My iend laughed and then became suddenly serious. " And the way

you English back the Jews in Palestine makes him rave. Not indee that he has any use for the Arabs. To him they are just the same a Negroes though with paler skins."

I didn't see him again as he had to go to Nuremberg to cover Hitler speech at the Nazi Rally. So next evening I invited his deputy t dine with me and afterwards we went on to a cinema in th Friedrichstrasse. It was all Nuremberg. First, Hitler's state entr into the old town—he, standing in the car like an emperor in triumphal chariot, his arm outstretched in the Nazi salute ; flag everywhere ; Police and S.S. everywhere and masses of onlooker on the pavements. But—over our sound-track—not so much nois as I had expected and no *Sieg Heils*. And the cinema audience, too was strangely silent. After about ten minutes of the entry we wer given views of the stadium and of Nazi crowds at previous rallies Then came a pause and then a long close-up of the Fuehrer turnin this way and that with a frightful scowl on his face. And then— almost a surprise—the moving pictures were replaced by a still— Hitler's picture. There was—again surprisingly—dead silence, an then his voice. He had started his speech at Nuremberg and it wa being relayed to us. The next thirty minutes or so were tense. Firs he spoke of patriotism. The *Sieg Heils* were loud and long. The he made some jokes and we heard the roars of laughter from Nurem berg. Then his voice changed tone. It was militant and insulting He had reached Czechoslovakia. Our cinema audience was dea still as the harsh voice rose and fell. And then the climax in scream of menace. Only four words : " *Benes* ! *Halt dein Maul* ! There was a pause unbroken by noise even from Nuremberg. As fo our audience it just gasped quite audibly. And then pandemoniu from the relay—a terrific wave of *Sieg Heils*, so terrific that I coul almost see the serried ranks and the waving arms at the rally. But i our cinema stone silence again. I looked round in the dim light Every eye seemed hypnotized by the furrowed forehead, the glarin eyes and the dank hair of the face on the screen. I felt a long wa from home.

Both of us were silent on the walk back to the *Kaiserhof*. But o the steps of the hotel my guest suddenly said : " What do you thin England will do ? " I was thinking more what I would do as, afte what I had seen and heard, Germany was certainly no place for me I was for home as quickly as possible. So I set to, to pack. An packing made me hungry, and all that there was to eat were som chocolates in a smart box which my Jerusalem staff had given me fo my journey. I had eaten perhaps three or four out of the top layer but now, when I opened the box, no longer were the chocolates i neat rows in their coloured tinsel paper. They were all over th place and the disorder went right down to the bottom. This was n

ild pilfering by a chambermaid. Someone had given that box a ry thorough look-over. It was not a pleasant reflection, but when got over the shock I just sat down and giggled to think what a sell ie unknown must have had when he found no secret document dden under the bottom layer. I then looked at my other effects. othing seemed to be missing except some markers in my diary hich I had happily written with great caution since Warsaw. nyhow, that was that, and I went to bed rather queasily. About ree hours later I woke with a start. I looked out of my window hich opened on the Wilhelmstrasse. " Jingle, jingle : klip, klop ; ngle-jingle : klip, klop." It was a troop of horse gunners with their uns on their way to the Anhalter station and the Czechoslovakian ontier.

I didn't try to sleep again ; and by seven my bags were packed and went down to see about an air passage. The night porter was still n duty. He treated me with great respect and called me "*Excellenz*." e would, he said, ring up Tempelhof at once and see what could be one. Would I leave my passport with him as the aerodrome people ere sure to ask for details ? I agreed, of course, but felt awful ; r when I am a bit jumpy abroad, I do like the feel of my passport in y pocket very much indeed. However after a quick breakfast I ound to my relief that the man had booked me a place on a Belgian lane to Brussels where, he had been assured, I would get another ne easily for London. Then he gave me back my passport and sked me to settle my bill. Another shock but, this time, a comic nock—my bill made out to " Herr Minister Tweedy ". Hence the *Excellenz* ". Coming on top of everything else this Minister usiness was fantastic. I thought again of how my poor chocolates ad been tooth-combed and burst out laughing, paid the bill, forgot y cares and had another good giggle when in the hearing of the xi-driver, the porter whom I had tipped lavishly, bade me farewell, *Auf baldiges wiedersehen, Excellenz*."

Tempelhof had changed a lot since I had landed there three days efore. There was a war atmosphere everywhere. Our start was elayed an hour by endless controls and our passengers were nervy nd pre-occupied and, in the case of one woman, tearful. The relief f being airborne and off Nazi soil was immense, but we came down gain at the frontier station and there we were put through it all again. was horribly thorough and nerve-wracking. Then airborne again nd over the frontier and in less than no time down in Brussels where got a seat at once for Croydon.

My first English evening paper had the banner headline Chamberlain going to see Hitler ". It was the first stage of the oad that led to Munich. And that was only 13 years ago.

THE INDIVIDUAL AND SOCIAL PURPOSE—II.

By Louis Arnaud Reid

IN the first part of this article I tried to clear up some of the term we use in talking of a subject such as "the individual an social purpose". We tend to employ words like 'individual and 'social' in too abstract a way—too abstract at least when it get in the way of our thinking of society as made up of persons living thinking, purposing together. There is certainly much that i impersonal in modern life: the problem is to make the impersona the servant, not the master, of persons, or as far as possible t humanize it. In the same way 'social purpose', which has a impersonal sound, needs to be humanized. 'Social purpose' is i the end what persons, knowing and willing together, want for persons Everyone thinks he knows what 'good social purpose' is. Everyon can give lists which include such things as good wages, housing education, the amenities and comforts of life. Certainly all thes things are 'good' and the absence of them 'bad': disease, naked ness, slums and hovels are humanly stunting, and many materia things are conditions and even part of human dignity and expansion On the other hand, as Kant said, without the good will anything ma be corrupted, and it is with the good will that things are *made* good.

Nevertheless, though good may lie in the good will, there is no much emphasis upon the part which social sciences and socia controls, using modern knowledge and technical devices, can pla not only in the bettering of man's conditions, but in the bettering o his very life. We have to be careful to do full justice to this, an also to see its limits. There is no doubt that the spiritual life of ma itself, and not only his material welfare, can be deeply affected by th social, economic, and physical conditions in which he lives. Fir the Nazis and now the Communists appear to be able to mould an perhaps even to destroy the human soul by deliberate technique And in any society, knowledge of modern medicine, psychology, an sociology seem to be able to invade and affect the very structure o personality itself. The alarming thing about this is that in theor there seem to be no limits to it.

Are we then to think that in time human personality can be whol conditioned by scientists (into whose own conditioning it might b

* "The Individual and Social Purpose—1." The Fortnightly, August, 1951.

mpolitic presently to inquire) ? Will human freedom—or what we ike to suppose is human freedom—cease to be ? Or—as modern heologians have had to rethink the nature of prayer (because what ve used to pray for can often nowadays be settled by a little applied cience)—can we rethink freedom ? I think we can.

We have to begin by admitting that certain psychological conditions nust be present before there can be morality or moral choice at all. Human beings below a certain level of intelligence or who suffer from certain insanities cannot, in the ordinary sense, be free or moral. And in so far as such conditions are either producible, or removable, by psychologists or doctors, we must say that they have power to decide whether a human person shall be a person or not. And if it were possible, by some fiendish enlightenment, to destroy human freedom entirely, to abolish man, then of course our present questions would not arise. No questions would ever arise.

Coming back to the common daylight, the social scientist, the psychologist and the doctor have wide power of influencing the content of morality, the level at which it takes place, and in some measure its quality. Alter the home and social setting of a young delinquent, and from being aggressively anti-social he may become co-operative and affectionate. Change the setting, and the temptation to steal will vanish, though it may be replaced by other temptations. Alter hormone balance and the character of responses will be changed. I do not think this means that moral character and behaviour can, at least in principle, be wholly conditioned from without, that total moral determination is possible, and therefore the cancellation of freedom. What happens is only an extension of what is always happening without any damage to freedom : the definition, by various conditioning factors, of the situation within which free choice can operate. The situations within which we choose morally are always severely defined by circumstances over which we have no control. My duties and my temptations are those of my particular setting and situation, which are given me and which I do not make. What I ought to choose will be affected in part by my nature, temperament and gifts ; temperaments and gifts have their dangers and duties. I must be judged by the use that I make of my capacities, but they at any moment are the product of the past. These things, and many others, are pre-defined and in a sense pre-determined, and scientific conditioning simply modifies nature or alters the conditions under which we choose, even to some extent alters the range of possibilities of the choosing personality.

But all this conditioning and determination—whether natural or deliberate—does not affect the power of free moral choosing within the defined, conditioned, and determined situation, whatever it is. The situation within which I choose is always enormously limited and

determined by nature or plan. I cannot at the moment of choi alter that, but I can (and must) accept what is given me ; I can choo within those limits, and this choice is both an expression of my mor freedom and an influence on the future formation of my charact through free choice. Planning and social control, however far carrie do not touch this.

I ought to make it clear that I am not here arguing for freedom choice.* This is of course an ancient problem, and it might be sa that the determinations and conditionings I have admitted ar asserted do invalidate the claim to any freedom. But if so, what ma be roughly dubbed the ' natural ' determinations will affect freedo just as much as the humanly devised ones. I am only arguing th they are both in the same case. If there is freedom, as I believe, ar it remains inviolate in spite of our vast determination and the narro range within which we can freely choose, then it also remains inviola by the controlling manipulations of man. And it is important n only to recognize this theoretically but practically too. For t belief that he is the victim of a vast impersonal machine may demoralize him that he ceases to believe that he can exercise his freedo

We come back to the point in the first article : that the goo conditions for living which society can organize have to be mad humanly good, to be creatively transformed by persons aware of the trans-social and infinite capacity. For the field of this awareness the field of freedom. It is a personal life which cannot be exhau tively socially conditioned. Moreover, if the life of spiritual freedo is not in some measure that to which social purposing is tending, the the fate of social purpose is to produce dead sea fruit. If the aims social purpose are limited to producing the conditions of an imagine good life without a vision of what the free life of the spirit can be, t happiness and content of that society will be puzzlingly and perp tually elusive.

If, on the other hand, the realization of what free personal life an personal relations can be, could enter into the life and planning society, permeating, leavening, then the really good and hap society would be coming nearer. ' Social purpose ' would be goo social purpose because, created by persons, it would make possib the fuller lives of persons in society.

The interpretation of the meaning of this fullness of human livi will, of course, depend upon the doctrine of man and of his relati to the universe. If we adopt a strictly secular-humanist attitude, shall be bound to look for the fullness of human life in the be achievements of human beings and in their human growth in t future. We shall emphasize culture and all the human virtues

* For a somewhat fuller treatment see the present writer's article "An Argument that Man is Fre THE FORTNIGHTLY, March 1949.

ll expounded from Plato and the Stoics onwards. We shall also rtainly, living in a Christian (even if it is a post-Christian) era, nphasize what are commonly called the Christian ethical values—other-love, humility, and so on. But if the humanism remains ite definitely secular or non-religious humanism, these humanly od things will be conceived in a universal setting which is impersonal d, in the strict sense, meaningless. The life of man will be, on this owing and as far as we know, the supremely good thing, and man his best will truly be the measure of all things. The perspective such an idea of good will be quite different from that of, say, the ristian theist for whom the love of man by man and of man by od and of God by man are different facets of one single truth. And lture—in science, in the arts, in the life of societies—will not be nply human fulfilment and happiness but entry into the enjoyment Divine and infinite gifts. Human activities will be ways of the rification of God, in confession, in worship, in service, in art, in thought of science or philosophy. On the Christian-theistic w, personal life and personal relations have not simply a human t also a cosmic significance, so that while there is always a distinction tween the personal and the impersonal, in the end the impersonal—ether it be the vast interstellar spaces or the organization of an ice—is conceived in relation to the personal.

Of the many general difficulties of putting all this into practice, two y be mentioned. One—the necessary tension which exists, in cial as in other thinking, between the abstract and the concrete, and the errors to which too abstract thinking is peculiarly liable—has en discussed. The other is the problem of the tendency to sub-tute abstractions and also routine habits, for personal relations. social thinking and planning more is required than constant areness of the needs of the concrete situation—as an architect must aware of the many purposes of a building he plans, or a civil gineer of the nature of the country where his dam is being built. is only takes us as far as ' social engineering '. But ' engineering ' even ' planning ' are words with severe limitations. For in social nking and planning it is people who are being planned. And it is e both that there are limits beyond which people cannot and should t be planned, and that even so far as they can be, a different sort of owledge of them is required from any knowledge of things.

Buber, Marcel and others have taught us the difference, *toto coelo*, tween the I-It and the I-Thou relationship. When we think of cial planning, we think of people as ' it ' or ' them '. This is the entific—and organizing—attitude, and it is, of course, entirely cessary and not at all wrong at times to regard human beings as ities to be organized, manipulated and moved about. Every drill geant, schoolmaster, bus-conductor, works' manager does it.

Likewise, sometimes human beings must be regarded as means t ends, but never wholly. This scientific, organizing attitude, or th attitude to instruments, appropriate to its own objects, knows nothin of people. This knowledge of other people is liable to all sorts o obstruction, from egotism, love of power, lack of sympathy an charity, pleasure in manipulation, and so on. In this connection th very habits of organization, of the power associated with it, of thinl ing of human beings abstractly, collectively, in the mass as ' them of manipulating, of being remote—all these are great temptation and inhibitions of the obligation to be aware of persons as person That is to say it is not only difficult to make planning-though sufficiently concrete as well as abstract ; the concrete awareness her is of an entirely different kind from that required for the awareness o things, a spiritual and moral awareness which is humanly hard t attain to, and which demands an outgoing human *caritas* won onl by self-effacing effort.

And, of course, the human material which is ' planned ' is th less ' material ' because human beings are free. The ' planned human being may have to work within a planned framework, bu exactly what he does and the way he does it cannot all be planned, o he would be nothing but an automaton. What happens really that he is offered by the ' plan ' certain limited opportunities which h can use, and chooses to use in certain ways, for better or worse. S that when the social planner plans for social good he can neve (as has been suggested) directly plan the good but only better oppo tunities for its realization. This realization has to be created by th people themselves. If the vital fact of freedom is forgotten so tha there is no enlistment of or education for free co-operation in the plan then either the planning will break down and fail, or it will become th mechanical plan of a dictatorship in which human personality degraded and democracy destroyed. It is safer not to overlook th possibility of either of those dangers.

I have not tried to be immediately practical (except in the sense tha to reflect about ultimate aims is the most practical thing in the world and perhaps it is more fitting for a philosopher by training an experience that this should be so. But the topic is of cours immensely practical, and the actual business of making a planne society humanly better has got to be worked out practically in it infinite everyday detail by the men on the job. There are endles examples—such as the planning of new schools with all the person interested groups, authorities, material and spiritual factors involved or of industrial planning and joint consultative committees ; or o health services or food control ; of life on committees or of officials of meetings which are representative of party interests, and of other which are meetings of persons ; of dictatorial directions, of devolu

on and the giving of responsibility, and so on.

Two main things which can only be supplied by individual persons re required for what may (still vaguely) be called better ' social urpose'. The first is respect for and cultivation of the free personal fe, which is beyond all social planning, in which we come to discover ne important things of the spirit, the attainment of which should, in ne very last resort, be the end and aim of planning. Without this sion all people, and all planning peoples, will surely perish. The cond requirement is, if anything, more difficult. It is the infusion f something of this spirit into the highly organized life of modern ociety, so that ' freedom ' is not separated from daily life as ' leisure ' separated from ' work ', not something to be attained after the ins of organization have been laid down, but something which is trinsic to daily work itself, sweetening every part and making it uman.

As Professor Mace recently put it : " we need to design each job f work as we design a life, which . . . is in the manner that an artist esigns a picture."* Much thought is in fact being given to this ideal y good and intelligent men who are expert in various fields of modern rganized society ; they must lead us, for it is a problem of expertise s well as of principle.

(The author is Professor of Philosophy of Education in the University of London.)

*C. A. Mace, page 135 of *Question*, Volume 3, No. 2. Hammond & Hammond, Spring 1951.

ENGLISH POETRY : 1938-1950—I.

By Herbert Palmer

ENGLISH poetry between 1938 and 1950 is a shifting scene of various shades and colours, from which it is difficult to extract a stable and formal pattern. The threshold of war was marked by the appearance of two traditional collections of verse by winners of the Newdigate Prize, Phyllis Hartnoll and Margaret Stanley-Wrench, and a first volume, *Gwalia Deserta*, by Idris Davies, a Welsh poet with strong affinities to Huw Menai and the Derbyshire poet, T. C. Boden, linked to them both in his social background and traditional diction. Of T. C. Boden's first volume, *Out of the Coal Fields* (1929) Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch wrote in an admiring preface : " The boy sings fiercely, demanding air and light. But he sings for those who have ears to hear," and much the same might be said of the first volume by Idris Davies, a human document always. It was followed by *The Angry Summer* and *Tony-Pandy*.

Many of the newcomers served with the Forces, and they expressed their sufferings and resentments in verse that was often harsh and desiccated, its realism disturbed and obscured by much odd symbolism. There was little of the patriotism and sensuous passion of Rupert Brooke, and little also of the stark and melodious realism of Siegfried Sassoon and the early Robert Graves. As it was a people's war nearly as much as a soldier's war, some of the best war-verse was written by those older poets who could not serve in the field. Among them should be singled out for special mention, two or three lyrics by Dorothy Sayers and Sylvia Lynd, some bitter but melodious explosions by Lord Vansittart, and many lyrics and descriptive pieces by Wilfrid Gibson. To these I think I may be allowed to add some war poems of my own (republished in *The Gallows-Cross* and *A Sword in the Desert*). Then there was a strange dynamic volume by the late Edward Thompson (who served as chaplain and won the M.C. during the 1914-1918 war) entitled *New Recessional*, which exploited the new rhythms and much also of the social bitterness and despair. Lord Dunsany also joins this throng, and next to Dorothy Sayers in her lyric "The English War", he has perhaps expressed better than anyone else the peculiar fearless attitude of the common civilian, though technically the lines are very slight and not up to his best level :

" Did they come over you again today ? "
A lady asked another near the sea.
" Some came and some are down ", I heard her say,
" And two are burning over near that tree.
But won't you have another cup of tea ? "

he most poignantly moving of any of the volumes was the elegiac *heet Anchor*, a series of impassioned love poems by Eve Stuart, ritten in memory of her husband, a naval officer who died on duty.

But the verse which was finally to make the greatest impression was ritten by Alun Lewis and Sidney Keyes, two young soldiers who lost ieir lives. Alun Lewis was much occupied by the themes of love nd death, and during the war he was the more popular of the two. Ie is more traditional than Sidney Keyes and might have fitted into ne of Sir Edward Marsh's " Georgian Anthologies ". But the gleam f magic occurs more frequently in the verse of Sidney Keyes. His nportance, however, has been over-emphasized, for his diction is ften too odd and obscure and his debt to T. S. Eliot and the symbo- sts too pronounced. Other poets who lost their lives in the war and re deserving of special mention are Richard Spender (a relative of tephen Spender), Nigel Weir, John Jarmain and Keith Douglas. John armain's poem on indiscriminate bombing, " The Innocent Shall uffer ", is surely one of the most searing and moving poems which ame out of the war.

A little book of verse which achieved a wide circulation during 941-1943 was *First Poems* by Richard Elwes (Lt.-Col.), one with an lizabethan tang and of which Desmond MacCarthy wrote in the *unday Times* : " He has listened to the cadences of Shakespeare's onnets with such complete response that their lovely mounting rdour has controlled his own sonnets." Be that as it may, it was npopular with the new poets because of its strong traditional avour, and they condemned it as " Rupert-Brooke-ish ". To my nowledge none of the other little books of verse were so widely istributed (over 17,000 copies of it were sold), though there were ome beckoning changes in the bewildering panorama. Modern oetry became a little more lucid, a little more human, a little more raditional, and the harp-strings were tightened. But there was only fractional diminishing of error and cacophany. The war acted as no room to sweep away all the rubble, dust and cobwebs. These nnoyances and depressions were only diminished. The floors ecame cleaner and a faint light stole through the murky windows. Vhat had been going on for over a decade was not only something iat seemed "rooted in a denial of Life"* but a wrong assessment of ie French symbolists, the chief parents of modern poetry. Baudelaire, erlaine and Rimbaud pointed the way to a new country along the

* This phrase is quoted from an article by Desmond MacCarthy.

borders of a morass ; but after them Mallarmé, Paul Valéry and others trod too near the edge of the morass, and their English followers plunged right into the morass. Our new poets seemed to think that originality consisted in vagueness of theme, shapelessness of form and content, and over-profuse embroidery, often of mere sackcloth. The symbolist movement in France, and afterwards in Germany, was salutary and necessary because both French and German poetry had become narrowed and stereotyped by rhetoric ; but English poetry needed no such movement, for we had had our symbolists and semi-symbolists and the many poets related to them. Yes, English poetry, judged in bulk, had always been a little different. We had had Blake and Coleridge, Poe and Mangan and William Morris. We had had the metaphysicals and the spasmodics. We had had the half-lights, the double-lights and the will-o'-the wisps. There had been darkness and madness on the housetops, and vision and bright candles in the cellars. The strange, the suggestive, the fantastical and the light that never was on sea or land, had everywhere been granted full opportunities of display. Everything to fertilize and invigorate English poetry when it drooped into decline had been cast upon the fallow fields. There was no need of any pronounced symbolist movement in England, and when it happened it was only to smother and stifle poetry that had a general appeal.

But though the Georgians strongly opposed rhetoric, so strongly, indeed, that Swinburne, Kipling and even Tennyson were cold-shouldered, they were unable to give final enduring shape to their assumptions and convictions. Flecker with his "Gates of Damascus" and Squire with his " Lily of Malud " seemed to forestall something of the strangeness of T. S. Eliot, but only a few of their followers were able to read astronomy. Into the gap rushed the post-symbolists, the new symbolists, T. S. Eliot and his followers. And their verse, in its frequent rejection of the mechanics of poetry, bore little relationship to what their French grandparents had achieved. Much of the new poetry, because of its lack of feeling and melody, its disregard of syntax imposing on confusion of content and disregard of the logical imagination, seemed to be something that could be written easily, something that almost any literary or semi-literary mind could produce, so that the market became flooded. And the critics were often too ignorant and opportunist to sift the good from the bad. During the 1939-1945 war and the years immediately preceding it curiosity produced sales and a public. But then came the inevitable recoil—satiety, and with satiety much disillusion. Numerous as were the poets and verse-writers they were not numerous enough to live on one another, and the sensitive man-in-the-street felt that he had been imposed on and let down. So after 1946 the sales and

blication of all new verse began to dwindle, with the unfortunate ult that many good volumes in manuscript were rejected by blishers. But now, as I write in 1951, another movement is afoot— e that will surely include many of those poets who have been uffed or have lost their way.

Poets of different degrees of consequence, other than those already ntioned, who made their first appearance, or chief appearance, er 1937, include John Arlott, Peter Baker, John Bayliss, Arthur ll, Arthur J. Bull, Frances Bellerby, Arnold V. Bowen, John xton, Alex Comfort, Herbert Corby, Leonard Clark, Paul Dehn, tric Dickinson, Laurence Durrell, Robert Farren, G. S. Fraser, ristopher Fry, Roy Fuller, Wrey Gardiner, Muriel Grainger, bert Greacen, Douglas Gibson, H. W. Harding, John ath-Stubbs, Phoebe Hesketh, James Kirkup, Kenneth Hopkins, ana James, Wrenne Jarman, Sean Jennett, Laurie Lee, Maurice ndsay, Emanuel Litvinoff, Patrick MacDonogh, Donagh Mac- nagh, Roy McFadden, Nicholas Moore, Norman Nicholson, T. Prince, Kathleen Raine, Henry Reed, Anne Ridler, Alan ok, W. R. Rodgers, A. L. Rowse, Clive Sansom, Ian Serrailler, ancis Scarfe, E. J. Scovell, Howard Sergeant, John Short, Derek nford, Hal Summers, Terence Tiller, Henry Treece, Ruthven dd, G. A. Wagner, John Waller,Vernon P. Watkins, Mary Winter ere and Margaret Willy.

All of them have received some sort of recognition, have published e or more volumes and are represented in from one to over half a zen of the numerous modern anthologies published since 1938— which the chief of the period seem to be : *Poems of the War Years*, mpiled by Maurice Woolman ; *Poems of To-day : fourth series*, mpiled by the English Association ; the Best-Poems-of-the-Year ies selected by Thomas Moult, the last issue of which is *The Best ems of* 1943 ; *Poems of this War*, edited by Patricia Ledward and lin Strang (Peter Baker) ; *Poems for France*, collected by Nancy nard ; *An Anthology of Contemporary Northern Poetry*,* one of ee collections edited by Howard Sergeant, a new north-country et who shepherds other new poets, and because he himself has anged somewhat from traditionalism to modernism is not too rrow in his appreciation. To these, perhaps, ought to be added e Greenwood Anthology of New Verse, a volume of wartime poetry ich I compiled from the best of a thousand manuscripts submitted 1943, the first of the three occasions on which I judged the Annual eenwood Prize. But the winning poem, " Behold the Jew " by la Jackson (an English poet better known in America than in this untry) was too long for inclusion ; an exceptionally virile piece

* This regional anthology is more of a period collection than any of the Irish, Scottish and Welsh Faber anthologies, because nearly all the poems in it were written after 1938.

of narrative work it has been published in a separate volume and became a " best-seller ".

Four of the listed poets, Arthur Ball, Arthur J. Bull, Leonard Clark and Clive Sansom are occupied in the educational world and perhaps could come under the term " schoolmaster-poet ", a term which applied to C. Day Lewis previous to 1936 and to myself previous to 1922. They are all, therefore, sufficiently disciplined and traditional, but Arthur Ball, a pastoral Scottish poet is very different from Arthur J. Bull in that, like Leonard Clark, he seems to owe something to Walter de la Mare.

Little books of verse which I sufficiently admired to venture on introductory prefaces included the *Thirty-three Poems* by Douglas Gibson, a pastoral poet with a human background ; a selection from the manuscript lyrics of Arnold V. Bowen ; and a selection from the published lyrics of Mary Winter Were, a Catholic poet whose simple verse contains strong affirmations of Christian faith, such as :

> I am so happy at sleep in the Heart of God . . .
> When the night is quiet on the land
> And the wings of death
> Are silenced in summer skies ;
> Poised betwixt earth and heaven, my soul takes breath,
> And into mine eyes
> Love smiles the vision of peace
> That about me lies—
> The Past-understanding Peace, the Peace Christ-given,
> The Peace of the earth Christ-trod ;
> I am so happy at sleep in the Heart of God !

But Mary Winter Were was not quite a new poet ; only in her wartime volume of selected verse, *Cross and Shrine*, she was able to marshal her talents to better advantage. Another Christian poet, but only distantly linked to Mary Winter Were because he has associated himself with the modernists, is Francis Scarfe.* His " Ode to Christ " is eminently religious and Christian. A very pronounced Christian poet, and one who has not been included in any of the anthologies and has published privately, is Bruno Walker, a priest in a Trappist monastery. His three volumes, *Wind on Charnwood*, *Charnwood Psalter*, and *Name from Afar* reveal him as an aloof Catholic mystic whose vision is often incomprehensible to the layman. Bruno Walker has been influenced by Gerard Manley Hopkins, but has avoided all that strange poet's worst mannerisms. The last line of one of his sonnets seems to explain the plight of many modern poets : " Though slain the singer by creation's pain ".

(The second and concluding parts of Mr. Palmer's article will be published in the October and November issues of THE FORTNIGHTLY.)

* He has written an enthusiastic book about them, *Auden and After*. But his best work has little in common with them.

VICTORIAN FAMILY LIFE IN THE HEBRIDES

By Joan Curl

ON the isle of Raasay, just east of Skye, there stands a large white house which would not look the least out of place among English parkland. In front of it, a green lawn complete with undial slopes down to the sea; on either side are shrubberies; ehind lies a walled garden, behind that again a walled orchard and leasant walks laid out among massed rhododendrons. Then come arch plantations, carpeted with bluebells in June, and beyond them noorland, rising to the flat-topped cone of Dun Can (once thought o be higher than the Coolins themselves).

The original Raasay House, seat of the MacLeods of Raasay, was urned down in 1746 as a reprisal for the laird's part in the Rising. he present house, with the exception of the north wing, was built oon afterwards. Dr. Johnson and Boswell spent some of their appiest days here in 1773, being royally entertained and finding in aasay the old patriarchal life that they sought, usually in vain, hroughout the Highlands. The room and even the bed (a sturdy rass one with padded green headboard) that Johnson occupied are hown to interested visitors—an unusual variation on the "Queen lizabeth slept here" theme.

In 1846 the island was sold by the impoverished laird to an English entleman named Rainy. It was just about the time when enthusiasm or the Highlands, originating at the most exalted level, was becoming ontagious. Mr. Rainy was, however, no absentee landlord, opening p an otherwise empty mansion for a few weeks in the autumn. He, is family and friends, spent a great part of the year on Raasay. heir comings and goings, together with other miscellaneous items, ere noted in a logbook kept by the butler. Its main purpose was to ecord the weather, and for many years daily entries were made of arometer, sympiesometer and thermometer readings, amount of ain, direction and force of wind, phase of moon, and any exceptional henomena such as northern lights, eclipses and comets.

The ordinary reader, delving into the logbook perhaps during a day f rain, finds the most interesting information under the heading of Remarks". In his brief entries, in a sloping hand going brown ith age, the butler has sketched a picture of life on a Hebridean land as lived by an English family in the Victorian era.

Perhaps it would be appropriate for our first quotation to be

" Humiliation. Mr. Kippen preached." Each Sunday (except when no English service was held), the subject or the text of the sermon, with chapter and verse, is duly entered.

Raasay had no pier in those days. The Portree steamer sometimes came into the bay and rowboats put out to meet her, as they do to this day on some other Hebridean islands. In this way a new dog-cart arrived one day ; so did a plumber and a smith from Glasgow to fit a new range. At 5 o'clock one April morning the steamer " left Bread Basket, Dairy Maid and Mary Jane." On another occasion it arrived at 8 p.m. with " Bull and Dairy Maid and Painters."

The family went about in their own yacht, sailing from their little private harbour below the house. The gig-boat was forever making its way to Portree to pick up goods left there by the steamer when it had omitted to call in Raasay Bay. Another boat crossed the Sound to Sconser for the mails every weekday, except when prevented by bad weather—as it sometimes was for days on end. Sailing-ships brought a variety of cargoes : meal, seed oats, timber, stone, slate, coals (three kinds, English, Scotch and smithy), lime, beer, artificial manure, brandy, port, oil, potatoes, barley, hay. The last three were regularly grown on the island ; their importation suggests a bad or a late harvest.

The fact that the major events of the farming year are also entered in the logbook indicates the community of interest—at least up to a point—between all dwellers in remote places. So we read that oats were sown in mid-March, " bare or barley " and " Swedes turnips " in May ; that in some years the corn was cut in September, but in others was still standing in mid-October and was finally carted in November, when the Coolins were already snow-capped. In November the sheep were smeared. In May cattle were ferried to Portree market ; in June bags of wool were sent away ; in November a Leicestershire tup landed, and in March : " The poultry arrived this day, it ought to have been left here on Saturday, but by some mistake they were taken on to Portree." In April the rabbit-catcher left, having accounted for 3,442 rabbits.

Other items, in which no doubt the butler took a more acute professional interest, concerned the provisioning of this comparatively isolated household. The slaughtering of cows, sheep and lambs are recorded, the arrival of a quarter of beef from Sligachan Inn, the receipt of a haunch of venison, the killing of the Big Pig, as well as the first dish of peas, new potatoes, gooseberries, strawberries, rhubarb and cherries from the well-stocked garden which Mr. Rainy had acquired from the MacLeods—and which is almost as great a rarity in the West Highlands to-day as it was when Boswell praised it nearly two centuries ago.

Throughout the autumn and winter quantities of game were sent

ay : grouse, woodcock, blackcock, snipe, pigeons, hares, venison. nfortunately Mr. Rainy's guests did not all confine their attentions what we now regard as legitimate game. One successful sportsman ot a golden eagle and " a large Hawk " one October, and two seals e following year.

Other amusements of the family and their visitors included trout-hing, otter-hunting, expeditions to the Raasay caves, to the Coolins d the Storr Rocks of Skye, cruises to remote islands (gentlemen ly) and collecting shells (ladies only). The ladies were, in fact, gaged in this useful employment at a time when most of the natives Raasay were preparing to leave their homes for ever. The entries r March, April and May 1855 tell their own story. " March 26th. r. McDonald at Raasay this day . . . to take the statements of such wish to emigrate." " April 9th. Mr. McDonald at Raasay this y to fill up the papers for the intended emigrants." Later in the nth the emigrants were vaccinated and clothes were distributed to em. Then on May 5 : " Six families left Raasay this day for ustralia." They were the first to go and many others followed. ie last entry relating to them was for June 16 : " 61 Sheep belonging the Raasay emigrants and other Tenants leaving the Island, llected and sold."

And now the Rainys are gone too. The steamer calls twice a day the new pier, but the island it serves so assiduously is practically inhabited. The great house, whose lofty rooms have been filled th music and laughter and good talk, echoes now the footsteps of e occasional visitor. And the hills of Skye, glorious with ever-anging light, still look across the Sound for the post-boat coming Sconser with the mails, for the yacht setting sail for far St. Kilda, d for the gig-boat on its way to Portree to pick up the poultry or e bread basket.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of THE FORTNIGHTLY

THE SCHUMAN PACT

Sir,

I am moved to record my chagrin over the prejudice against France exhibited by so eminent a savant and so sincere a liberal as Professor Bonn in the June number of THE FORTNIGHTLY.

I do not refer to the statement that the French ascribed their defeat to German strength even when they ought to have ascribed it to a variety of French weaknesses (though that is not the whole story and leaves out singularly the question whether Professor Bonn took pleasure from Hitler's temporary victory). I refer to two other points.

First, the deliberate, insulting statement that the French, " as in their habit," conceded the disappearance of the Ruhr Authority " behind the back of the British Government." I am sure that nobody besides Dr. Bonn is aware that this is a French habit ; and if it were, the memory of a certain naval treaty between London and Berlin is there to remind us that it is not exclusively a French habit. (For German diplomatic habits I refer Dr. Bonn to the Foreign Office publications on the matter.)

Secondly, to say that " France has usually been a querulous bedfellow in international affairs," is again to drag in gratuitously a prejudice unbecoming in a liberal and a " good European ". It was France who strove most energetically to make the League of Nations a going concern ; it is France which, to-day, is doing most to further the idea of European federation.

I should have thought that a "good European" of German origin would wish to give us of the west advice on how to make Germany a good neighbour, and would be content to forget that Louis XIV was the *Erbfeind* of Germanic hegemony over Europe.

Sincerely yours,
LEWIS GALANTIERE.

New York, U.S.A.

Dr. M. J. Bonn replies :

I am delighted that Mr. Lewis Galantière's letter to you gives me an opportunity for substantiating my statement that there is a French habit of making arrangements behind the back of the British Government :

1. The fact that France conceded to Germany the disappearance of the Ruhr Authority after the Schuman pact was in force, without previous consultation with the signatories of the Ruhr Statute, has not been denied by anybody.
2. The launching of the Schuman plan was sprung upon the British as a complete surprise—Dr. Adenauer seems to have been informed of it—which accounts partially for Britain's hostile reaction to it.
3. At the Versailles Peace Conference, the Allies had agreed amongst each other

not to have any oral negotiations with the German delegation. Notwithstanding this understanding, a representative of the Quai d'Orsay repeatedly met German representatives to discuss the co-operation between Ruhr coke and Lorraine Steel.

I was present at most of these meetings, and I have told the story in my book *andering Scholar*—I have as a matter of courtesy withheld the names of the partici-nts. Mr. Galantière is quite justified in criticizing the British naval agreement d German foreign policy, but he surely knows that two or even three blacks do not ake a white.

As to my second statement, that France was a querulous bedfellow in international airs, I should have written " administrations ". I quite agree with Mr. Galantière, at France is splendid when discussing great principles, as she did in the League, t anybody who has had to negotiate with her knows that the trouble begins when, er agreement on principles has been reached, issues are opened again on the " appli-tion ". British administrators on joint bodies moreover, for example in Egypt, ght be called as witnesses.

I am not aware of having dug up Louis XIV, but I am very glad that Mr. Galantière d so. Since his days France has considerably mended her ways, though it became finite only after the catastrophe of 1870-1871. This fact may justify our hopes at present-day Germany is undergoing a similar educative process.

---

the Editor of THE FORTNIGHTLY

THE INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICA

May I supplement the first paragraph of my article on " The Indians in South Africa" the July issue of THE FORTNIGHTLY? Over 142,000 (not 12,000) Indians had come to uth Africa as indentured labourers by 1911.

The need to condense prevented me from emphasizing that the treatment of the uth African Indians provides a test case of the white man's intentions in the Union. e Indians are much the smallest of the four chief racial groups and, therefore, ir admission to a fuller status of citizenship is least likely to provoke the white r of being outvoted ; secondly, the Indian community contains a notably higher portion than any other non-European group of those who are already fitted by ture, industry and economic position to exercise the rights and discharge the ponsibilities of citizenship. If, therefore, white South Africans ever intend to mit their coloured races into fuller political, economic and social partnership, we ould expect to find practical indications of that intention in their attitude to the dians. The facts, however, throw serious doubts upon the sincerity of the Union's otives in proclaiming, as Dr. Malan has recently done, the principle of trusteeship vards the coloured races.

Yours faithfully,
C. W. M. GELL.

stenburg, Transvaal, South Africa.

---

tters from Professor Michael Oakeshott on Mr. H. G. Nicholas's article " Political ucation " *and from Mr. Boris V. Koussev on Dr. Malcolm Burr's article* " Turkey d Bulgaria," *both in the last number of* THE FORTNIGHTLY, *will be published next nth.*

ASPECTS OF SHAKESPEARE

By FREDERICK S. BOAS

THREE of the recent contributions to Shakespearian criticism have one feature in common. In none of them does the title give an exact indication of the contents. Dr. Duthie who holds a Chair of English in McGill University, Montreal, has won a recognized position in Shakespearian scholarship by his editorial work on the "bad" quarto of *Hamlet* and on the text of *King Lear*. Any Elizabethan study from his pen is therefore welcome. But when a volume is labelled simply *Shakespeare** one expects a biography of the dramatist or a survey of his total output, or both combined. The note on the jacket, however, informs us that neither of these is to be found within. Only a limited number of the plays are discussed. *Much Ado About Nothing*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, *The Winter's Tale* and *The Tempest* are merely incidentally noticed, and *Julius Caesar* does not appear in the index.

The reasons for this discrepancy appear to be twofold. In the first place the book is one in a series, with what seems to be a prescribed length, for Dr. Duthie more than once speaks of lack of space. Secondly, as he tells in his foreword, he is approaching his subject mainly from a special point of view, and "as far as the bulk of the book is concerned, it might well have been entitled *The Order Theme in Shakespeare*." The publishers, in my opinion, would do well in any further edition to adopt this as sub-title of the volume.

The "order—disorder antithesis" which forms the subject of Dr. Duthie's second chapter, and is basic to his treatment throughout, is a conception derived by him, as he amply acknowledges, from Professor Lovejoy's *The Great Chain of Being* (1936), and later kindred studies :

> We have under God, in descending sequence, the categories of angelic beings, men, animals, plants, minerals. Angels are superior to men, men are superior to animals, animals to plants, plants to minerals . . .
>
> In each of these categories there are gradations also. The whole of reality is a great hierarchy, a system of degrees, gradations : everything has its duly appointed place in it. An essential feature of this system is *relation*. This stability of the universe depends on all created things maintaining their relationship with all other created things.

Taking in turn comedies, histories and tragedies, Dr. Duthie claims that to interpret rightly *The Taming of the Shrew*, which offends some modern tastes, it is necessary to see things as Shakespeare saw them. In his eyes the husband ruled the wife and her duty was to obey. "In refusing to accord her husband implicit obedience, Katharine is offending against the divinely established order of things." Her last speech is "an enunciation of the doctrine of orders as applied to the domestic milieu," guaranteeing peace and quiet life. In *As You Like It* there are two parallel cases of opponents of order. Duke Frederick has usurped the place of his elder brother, Duke Senior ; Oliver has behaved unnaturally towards his elder brother, Orlando. With the disorder in the court life is contrasted the country life in the forest of Arden, though, as Dr. Duthie points out in some interesting pages, this is not purely idyllic. In *Twelfth Night* the self-love of Malvolio, the steward, aspiring to the hand of the Countess Olivia, is a flagrant example of the violation of 'degree', of social order. Less evident is the origin in part of his hostility to Sir Toby in that the Knight is an anachronistic survival of the well-

* *Shakespeare*, by G. I. Duthie. Hutchinson's University Library. 7s. 6d.

born armed retainer of feudal times.

It is to those times that the history plays take us back. But when writing them Shakespeare, as Dr. Duthie emphasizes, was not merely chronicling past events but was finding lessons for the present and the future. *Richard II*, *Henry IV*, Parts I and II, and *Henry V* form one connected pattern. Richard, born to be an artist, lacks true regal qualities,and instead of being the source of order brings disorder into his kingdom, especially by his seizure of John of Gaunt's property. This leads to Bolingbroke's rebellion and Richard's deposition which he converts into an abdication. Whatever his faults he is an anointed King and Bolingbroke is guilty of sin. Hence springs further disorder in the rebellion of the Percys against Henry and in the riotous way of life, in Falstaff's company, of the heir to the throne. But with the transformation of Prince Hal into Henry V, and the rejection and death of Falstaff, order is restored. In Henry Dr. Duthie salutes, more unreservedly than in good company I am inclined to do, Shakespeare's ideal king.

There is nothing better in the book than the chapter on "Imaginative Interpretation", dealing with *Troilus and Cressida*, "a play about disorder, and *the disorder is never set right*." But against its 24 pages there are only 30 devoted to the tragedies, including the plays, and 12 to the last plays. It is this lack of proportion that mars a work of critical insight and generous appreciation of other interpreters.

*The Meaning of Shakespeare** is a posthumous publication by Dr. Harold C. Goddard, who was head of the English department of Swarthmore College. One cannot help feeling that the title makes a somewhat presumptuous claim, reinforced by the statement on the jacket that "Dr. Goddard fits together into an inclusive scheme all the aspects of Shakespeare's religious, moral, political and social convictions." It would be regrettable if thereby, or by its prolixity, running to nearly 700 folio pages, a prejudice were created against a thoughtful and stimulating, if at times provocative, volume. It covers everyone of Shakespeare's works from the early poems to *The Tempest*. Some words from the chapter on *Othello* may indicate Dr. Goddard's method of approval. "Shakespeare is nothing if not preparatory." By this he means that within each play there is progress from scene to scene, and that from play to play there is a linking chain. Even in *Venus and Adonis* and *The Rape of Lucrece* he finds forecasts of characters or situations in the plays. And the "meaning" of Shakespeare is to be found primarily in the flowering of his poetic imagination rather than in his art as a playwright.

In this elaboration of his thesis Dr. Goddard is often over-anxious to run a-tilt against generally accepted views. He is partly influenced by an anti-war attitude. He shows favour to the pacifist King in *Henry VI*, and prefers Faulconbridge in *King John* to the victor of Agincourt. In *A Midsummer Night's Dream* he asserts that "the moment when Bottom awakens from his dream is the supreme moment of the play," and that it represents "the awakening of spiritual life in the animal man." In *The Merchant of Venice* he tends to redress the balance in favour of Shylock as against Portia. He reaches a paradoxical peak when he declares that "only on the assumption that Hamlet ought not to have killed the King can the play be fitted into what then becomes the unbroken progress of Shakespeare's spiritual development." On the other hand his analysis of Falstaff into two personalities, the Immortal and the Immoral, is helpful, and of Iago embodying intellect in the service of hate. Often his exposition of apparently minor factors such as the storm in *Othello* or the third murderer in *Macbeth*, is subtle and suggestive. And of his interpretation of major situations that of the closing scene of *King Lear* may be cited as outstanding. Distinctive too of his commentary is his

* *The Meaning of Shakespeare*, by Harold C. Goddard. University of Chicago Press. Cambridge niversity Press. 45s.

use of psycho-analysis, of parallels from Dostoevsky's novels, and of quotations from Thoreau, Emerson and Emily Dickinson.*

It is unfortunate that Mr. Milton Crane should begin his study of *Shakespeare's Prose*† with the statement that it "is beyond question the finest body of prose by a writer in English." How is it possible to compare Shakespeare's prose with that (say) of Swift or Gibbon or Burke ? Nor does his title suggest that about 60 pages of this book deal with dramatic prose before and after him, mainly to show that Shakespeare's achievement gains in magnitude by comparison. That achievement is discussed by Mr. Crane under two chief headings, the prose of the comedies, together with *Henry IV* and *Henry V* and the last plays, and that of the tragedies together with 2 *Henry VI* and *Richard III*. In each play the character of the prose and its relation to the verse is carefully analyzed. This necessarily involves an amount of detail which cannot be particularized in a review, but which is helpful and suggestive. One or two illustrations may be given. "Falstaff is Shakespeare's greatest creation in comic prose, Hamlet in tragic prose. Falstaff speaks prose because he must ; verse is impossible for him. Hamlet, on the other hand, speaks some of the finest verse in all literature. His use of prose, then, springs from certain traits of his character and from the exigencies of his predicament." The prose of *King Lear* represents in turn cynical realism, bluff frankness, madness real and pretended, and "ultimately combines with verse to produce, in the extraordinary harmonies of the trial scene, a blending of forms that is unique in Shakespeare."

* In a quotation which he makes from my *Shakespeare and his Predecessors*, Dr. Goddard miscalls me, Franz Boas.

† *Shakespeare's Prose*, by Milton Crane. University of Chicago Press. Cambridge University Press. 21s.

MODERN FRANCE : PROBLEMS OF THE THIRD AND FOURTH REPUBLICS. Edited by Edward Meade Earle. *Princeton University Press : Geoffrey Cumberlege*. 40*s*.

In February 1950, the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton organized a conference on modern France at which papers were read by more than two dozen American scholars. These papers, with some amendments, are now published in a large and very useful volume to which M. André Siegfried contributes a general introductory chapter. They range over a wide field, including French social and cultural life, politics, economics, defence and foreign policy, and as is inevitable in any such symposium they vary a good deal in quality and in originality. Their common ground is that they express the views of the younger generation of American scholars who are concerning themselves with French affairs ; and to the English reader they are as interesting for their revelation of the American approach to French problems as for their analysis of French problems themselves. Could we in Britain, one reflects, muster an equally large team of equally well-informed professional students of France to produce such a volume ?

It is, perhaps, characteristic of the American approach that the volume should begin with a section labelled "The Decline of the French *élan vital*" and include in it a paper on "The desiccation of the *bourgeois* spirit." The whole section has the flavour of a young nation eager to understand the decline of an old ; respectful, sympathetic, yet filled with regret that idealism has gone hand in hand with a decline of power. "It is with extreme reluctance," writes Dr. J. B. Wolf of Minnesota, "that I reach the conclusion that the enlightenment of the eighteenth century must share the responsibility for the disorders of the twentieth." American idealism, too, sprang from the enlightenment of the eighteenth century, and such problems come nearer home than they do to most English-

men.

Among the most valuable contributions are those which study the connections between particular social classes in France and the components of national politics. David S. Landes on "French business and the business man", Kenneth Douglas on "The French intellectuals", Gordon Wright on "Communists and Peasantry in France", and H. Stuart Hughes on "Gaullism" all have much to say that is well-informed, stimulating and penetrating. And it is this kind of study which is most fruitful for the better understanding of France, if only because the French are so reluctant to do it themselves, or when they do it are so prone to be partisan. The candid friend—and most of these Americans fall into that category—can see the obvious which is so often forgotten. "It is clear", writes Gordon Wright, "that France contains a considerable rural proletariat and semi-proletariat, amounting to perhaps one third of the total farm population. . . Some small owners might also be classed as semi-proletarian . . . Large farms are common enough in certain regions to lend colour to the idea of a growing capitalist concentration in agriculture." Such facts, apt to be blurred by generalizations about a land of peasant landowners, go far to explain the strength of Communism in the countryside.

Professor Earle and his team of contributors are to be congratulated on making this fine and timely contribution to French studies. It deserves widespread attention in Britain.

DAVID THOMSON.

HISTORY AND HUMAN RELATIONS, by Herbert Butterfield. *Collins.* 10*s.* 6*d.*

These plain commonsensical essays form together an impressive *apologia* for the study of history. A moment's reflection will show that history, in spite of the general honour in which it is held, needs apologists. If one considers the actions of government, in a society where historical study is richly endowed and greatly pursued by not the least talented of young people, the first impression is of the uselessness of history. The treatment of Germany since the war, from the Nuremberg trials to the whole policy of re-education, has been so maladroit, so calculated to produce the very ills which all agreed must be avoided, that it is easy to maintain that history teaches nothing. It is not that the allied western governments scorn history or fail to take the advice of historians in forming their policies. They have earnestly tried to learn from history, and folly has been the result.

The trouble is, as Professor Butterfield shows, that history has so often been written to prove a case, to vindicate a party or a nation, that many of its most famous texts are unreliable guides to the past and, except in revealing how judgment can be overborne by passion and prejudice, give still less help in the present. Professor Butterfield in "Marxist History" and "Moral Judgments in History" illustrates the dangers of approaching the facts with preconceived theories. What is required and what academic history attempts is the discovery of what happened. Judgments, delivered against a modern background, of whether figures in the past did well or ill, are doubtful and even dangerous. It is enough to explain why they acted as they did.

The value of this humble attitude stands out in the first chapter on "The Tragic Element in Modern International Conflict." It is a natural tendency in these days to look for rights and wrongs in wars, but Professor Butterfield chooses to emphasize rather what he calls the "predicament"—the virtual necessity, for example, of clashes between Germany and the west, whoever the leaders on each side—and the present conflict between east and west, he suggests convincingly, would have been as sharp whatever persons and

politics ruled in Russia. The basis of such conflicts is the distribution of power in the world ; it is a problem of diplomacy, and ideology, puffing Communism up into Anti-Christ, merely clouds the issue.

Such glimpses of the essentials in a present situation are made possible by history truly studied and honestly served. It does not necessarily provide the solution, but it does make possible an understanding of the situation—a considerable advance on what public opinion generally achieves. This particular essay comes first in the book, but its wisdom, the sweep and fairness of its attitude to the disastrous cleavage in the world, are a justification of that academic history, often accused of dullness, for which Professor Butterfield argues in his other chapters. The academic historian is humble before the facts ; he wishes to present the thoughts of persons in history and not his own thoughts about them. It will be seen that certain problems remain. It is extremely difficult for a historian to prevent his own personality and beliefs from affecting his history. There is little doubt, however, that Professor Butterfield makes out his case against the many who would say that this attempt at self-discipline is not worth making.

WALTER JAMES

BRITANNICA BOOK OF THE YEAR 1951. *Encyclopaedia Britannica, Ltd.* £3.

To compress the events of 365 days into some 700 pages, without omitting any development of importance and yet allowing major articles to run to several thousand words, can be no easy task. The *Britannica Book of the Year* for 1951 has undoubtedly succeeded, however, in its difficult work of selection and compression. The editors have been wise in choosing a composite photograph of the Korean campaign as their frontispiece for the year. The entry under " Korean War " sets out the political background which led up to the crossing of the 38th Parallel by North Korean forces on June 25, 1950, and goes on to describe with great clarity the progress of the campaign to the end of the year.

Another outstanding contribution is " Communist Movement " by Mr. Max Beloff. " The Communist movement should properly be regarded," he writes, " as that movement which, under the leadership of the Politburo of the All-Union Communist party, had as its ultimate professed objective the transformation of the entire world into a single Communist State." From an examination of the Russian core of the movement Mr. Beloff goes on to study the Soviet-dominated countries, the Cominform, Western Europe, the " Peace Movement ", anti-Communist legislation and Chinese Communism as a part of his year's survey. In commenting on the fighting both in Korea and Indo-China Mr. Beloff draws attention to the great advantage derived by the Communist movement from its ability to choose any point on the circumference of the Soviet Union or China for attack and " thus force the Western Powers to sacrifice their long-term defence plans for the sake of stopping an immediate threat." From this depressing analysis of the advantages of interior lines enjoyed by the masters of the Asian land-mass, it is some consolation to turn to the entry under " Navies of the World " and find that at the end of 1950 only two navies could be considered as first-class, those of the United States and of Great Britain.

Other pominent contributions are the articler on " China " written by Mr. O. M. Green with statistical material supplied by Mr. Smogorzewski, the long entry under "Libraries" by Mr. F. L. Kent to mark the centenary of the passing of the Public Libraries Act in 1850, and the survey of the Schuman Plan under " European Coal and Steel Pool ".

GORDON WINTER

MY DEAR HOLMES : A STUDY IN SHERLOCK, by Gavin Brend. *Allen & Unwin.* 10*s.* 6*d.*

Mr. Brend begins this entertaining book with the remark that only four characters in English literature have achieved universal fame : Romeo, Shylock, Robinson Crusoe and Sherlock Holmes. We then learn that he had occasion to re-read the Holmes stories to his daughter, and it appears that he found, like many others, that to re-read Sherlock Holmes is to wish to know more about him than is expressly set out in the 60 tales in which his exploits are recorded. Mr. Brend, therefore, found himself enticed into a critical study of the Holmesian texts, a field of modern scholarship opened up by Monsignor Knox in his book, *Essays in Satire*, and a form of recreation immeasurably more enchanting than, say, the working out of crossword puzzles.

His primary aim was to fix the date of Holmes's investigation of each of his recorded cases. A mere superficial survey of Watson's writings is enough to show that this is no easy task ; he is curiously reticent on questions of importance in Holmes's career and in his own. It is necessary to draw inferences from the explicit data given, to compare dates with other dates, in short, to apply Holmes's own methods of investigation. Mr. Brend found that the only way to achieve his aim was to write Holmes's life.

This book is the outcome of his studies. It contains a fund of information about Holmes that may well surprise incurious readers of the Holmesian chronicles. For example, in them the date of his birth is not given, but in " His Last Bow " he is described as being on August 2nd, 1914 " a tall gaunt man of sixty." The date of his retirement from private practice is no

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

Documents on British Foreign Policy, 1919-39

Third Series, Volume IV, 1939

This volume covers the German invasion of Czecho-Slovakia and the subsequent British guarantee of assistance to Poland in the event of a German threat to her independence. 35s. 0d. (36s. 0d.)

African Local Government in Tanganyika

A progress report giving an overall, up-to-date picture of the differing stages of development reached in various parts of the trust territory.
(Colonial No. 277) 1s. 6d. (1s. 7½d.)

Government Scientific Organisation in the Civilian Field

A review of the post-war efforts of the Government to encourage fundamental research in the universities, and to further research and development industrially, agriculturally and medically. Bibliography. 1s. 6d. (1s. 7½d.)

Prices in brackets include postage

HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE

York House, Kingsway, London W.C.2 ; 429 Oxford Street, London W.1. (Post Orders: P.O. Box 569, London S.E.1.); 13A Castle Street, Edinburgh 2 ; 39 King Street, Manchester 2; 2 Edmund Street, Birmingham 3; 1 St. Andrew's Crescent, Cardiff; Tower Lane, Bristol 1 ; 80 Chichester Street, Belfast

OR THROUGH ANY BOOKSELLER

given, but in "The Creeping Man", the date of which is in September, 1903, Watson tells us that this case was one "of the very last handled by Holmes" and it seems reasonable to infer that he retired at the end of that year. Similarly it has been inferred that he began his university career in 1871. What his university was is a matter of controversy; Miss Dorothy Sayers holds that it was Cambridge. Mr. Brend devotes a chapter to an impressive (but, in the opinion of this reviewer, unconvincing) argument that it was Oxford. Another chapter is devoted to a closely reasoned discussion of the position of No. 221B Baker Street, where Holmes lived for many years; and the conclusion is that it was a house on the west side of Baker Street in the block lying between Blandford Street and Dorset Street. But in view of the correspondence on the subject in *The Times* some months ago, it seems improbable that this conclusion will be generally accepted.

Mr. Brend's book should delight those who know their Sherlock Holmes, and induce those who do not know him to join the ranks of those who do.

G. F. McCLEARY.

WILLIAM COWPER, by Norman Nicholson. *John Lehmann.* 10*s.* 6*d.*

Mr. Nicholson's approach to Cowper is a personal and a disarming one. He himself obviously has a great affection for Cowper's poetry and he communicates his enthusiasm very happily. This is not a book for the student who wants to know about Cowper for the purpose of passing exams; it is more valuable and more difficult to assess. If you do not already know *The Task* Mr. Nicholson will certainly persuade you to read it; if you have read and not liked it you may agree, under his guidance, to try again. You have to take his word for it—but it is a poet's word.

> He can be permitted faults which would be unpardonable in a lesser poet and unthinkable in a greater . . . all these we forgive him not for the sake of the poetry, but for his own sake. This, no doubt, is critical heresy; it would never do to allow our judgment of poetry in general to be biased and influenced in this way. Yet if we are to enjoy Cowper to the full at least part of our pleasure must come from factors which are outside the scope of literary criticism.

We know, surely, how subtly our own attitude to a living writer may change after we have met him, and liked or disliked his personality. The words do take on a tone that was not there before. My own feeling about this book is that it is two-thirds of a really outstanding work. Were it one third it would make a charming essay; as it is there is not quite enough to convince the sceptic, and Mr. Nicholson writes so well that one could do with a book twice as long and more.

The weakness lies only in the assumption that we *must* like William Cowper because he was what he was. It is the same tendency that assumes that we all must love Charles Lamb and the Emett railway and pet dogs. I am not asking Mr. Nicholson to write another kind of book, only a more substantial one of this kind.

Having said that, the critic must surrender to the particular charm of the writer: it is not often that poets write really good prose—genuine prose and not a kind of low-powered free verse. The chapter on the Olney Hymns owes a good deal to Bernard Manning's *The Hymns of Watts and Wesley* but is all the better for it, since that is a first-rate book. Whether or not we can all permit Cowper the faults that Mr. Nicholson can is another matter, but it is difficult to imagine a more persuasive advocate; or a better introduction to the works of a poet.

PATRIC DICKINSON

THREE NAMES FOR NICHOLAS, by Rupert Croft-Cooke. *Macmillan.* 9*s.* 6*d.*

THE CHARLIE TREES, by B. Dew Roberts. *Chatto & Windus.* 10*s.* 6*d.*

VERONICA, by Laura Pope. *Longmans.* 9*s.* 6*d.*

There are three separate phases in

the story of Mr. Rupert Croft-Cooke's hero, and in each he pursues under a different identity a materially and morally different course of life. Phase one finds him the young rector of a country parish, stifled by the prim correctness of his pursuits. The missionary fervour under whose influence he was ordained has long since been dulled and domesticated ; the energies he has dreamed of giving to the Christian ideal are dissipated in petty questions of precedence. In his heart he rebels, and his chance of escape comes when he survives unharmed an air raid which is believed to have killed him. He joins the army, leaving behind him a wife, two small daughters, and a memorial tablet in the village church. " Forsaking all and following" is the answer he gives to a questioner.

In his life during the war years, in his rough comradeship with three private soldiers, he thinks to have found a more essential Christianity. " One is no longer among the righteous—only among the good." But disillusionment comes with peace, in the discovery that what had seemed a lasting solution was in fact adventitious and unreal. Nor, Nicholas finds, is he able to resume his former vocation. At the close of the book he abandons introspection and embarks on yet a third life, having its centre in a universal love.

This bare outline of *Three Names for Nicholas* suggests only a part of the interest to be found in it. It is a novel which, both in theme and in the style of at least one section, invites comparison with Somerset Maugham's *The Razor's Edge*. For all that Mr. Maugham is the more resourceful and accomplished writer, one would say that of the two his book is the less adult. The story of the unstable Nicholas is told with candid sympathy, and while the author's viewpoint is positive, it never shapes events to unlikely ends. Mr. Croft-Cooke is above all a truthful writer, and at times he is a remarkably fine one.

The " Charlie trees " of Miss Robert's narrative are those which, tradition has it, were planted near Welsh Jacobite houses for the guidance of messengers from the exiled Stuart court. Jacobite intrigue, and the part played in it by a young Welshman, are in fact the sum and substance of this story. It is a heavily worked vein, and one comes to it with a suspicion which agreeably proves unjust. What makes *The Charlie Trees* pleasantly different from the common run of historical novels is the honesty of its treatment and its avoidance of the studiously picturesque. Francis Vaughan, the romantic young lawyer, is a likable and credible hero, and his adventures in the Stuart interest are entertainingly told. There is, too, a satisfying relation between the manner and the matter of the tale.

In contrast, Miss Laura Pope's *Veronica* aims at an importance it never achieves. One is not prepossessed by the hackneyed explanation of its narrator : " I have decided to write down the story of Veronica because in so doing I hope to gain some peace." Nor, as the story proceeds, is one given much sense of the " close and rare relationship " which is hinted at. One rather feels that Gerald, the narrator, is more of a fool than the author intended him to be. He is a man in middle-age, and a cripple, while the heroine is a girl of 18. Gerald is quick to observe " the shining nimbus of Veronica's purity ", which shines no less bright when she is " surrounded by the sordid trappings of her *métier*, consorting with pimps and prostitutes." From this odd juxtaposition springs the relationship between them and the events which bring unhappiness to them both. Miss Pope has a good descriptive talent, which here lends itself to the evocation of her chosen North African scene. But in the person of her narrator, she is a great deal too much given to meditating on Life ; it escapes the mesh of words she weaves around it.

JOHN EALES

BOOKS ON THE TABLE

Some of them have to be put apart, at bedside, on garden seat, or in desk drawer, for further savouring. The first swift reading has induced or quickened thought and the gratefully rare experience of pondering for pleasure is ours.

Infinite capacity

Such a book is STOLEN FIRE by Dallas Kenmare (*Williams & Norgate.* 8*s.* 6*d.*) and such its subject for the prolongations of reverie. It is the mystery and the ever fascinating study of genius, and the author does not pretend to solve the one, nor certainly has she lessened the other. She discusses what people from Carlyle to Albert Einstein, and many before, have defined as the secret that Prometheus found and hid, and she instances Chopin, Blake, Keats, Browning and kindred spirits in their own and other fields. But how much, if anything, has environment or heredity to do with the creation of genius ? Did Shelley the poet create the life lived by Shelley the man, or without the life he lived could we have had the poet ? The blind rages of William Morris—creative for him—in his daughter Jenny may have been transmuted into her futile epilepsy. Was he right when he cried : " If a chap can't compose an epic poem while he's weaving tapestry, he'd better shut up, he'll never do any good at all," or was Bernard Shaw hitting the fantastic nail on the head in concluding that : " Great men are fabulous monsters, like unicorns, griffins, dragons and heraldic lions " ?

The yoke of femininity

And on great women Miss Kenmare especially stimulates the desire to read the riddle. Is it biology's fault that a Sand, an Elizabeth Barrett, a Mrs. Webb, a Brontë, a Rosa Bonheur (or a Laura Knight and a Barbara Hepworth), a Myra Hess, an Ethel Smyth, a Marie Curie, are doled out so sparingly ? Or would the fire burn low in the female of the species whatever the birthright or the circumstances ? It is surely significant that such women rarely have children and, if they do, like the children of male genius they are usually unremarkable. In making the questions flow, *Stolen Fire* at least clarifies the asker's mind. The book is neither dogmatic nor rash, and its claim that the unusual in child or adult should be approached sympathetically, understandingly, to avoid mutual frustration and pain, is all the more compelling for its tentativeness.

The author of Evelina

This is naturally not a characteristic of the piece of ' reportage '—slick, streamlined and knowing all the answers to one particular woman's psychological make-up — that comes next. In fact, two scoldings are reserved for A DEGREE OF PRUDERY, Emily Hahn's biography of Fanny Burney (*Arthur Barker.* 18*s.*), before indulgence in the noble art of praising. The first is for the title, which makes a reader feel prudish and, so far from advertising the book, causes its seclusion in brief-case or between the folds of the evening paper, or at the lunch table unpropped. Fanny's sister Susan described her as having a degree of it, and American journalism leaps at a catchpenny title. The other complaint is of the author's own photograph on the wrapper back, also presumably catchpenny as she has a nice face under the roughly-cut hair ; otherwise, the relevance is entirely elusive. To one who has already encountered Emily Hahn's barbed opinions on the printed page, the reading of her book gave unexpected pleasure, all the more surprising because Fanny Burney, *Evelina* and *Cecilia* have hitherto had small appeal. It is the circle, adorned first by her father and finding ample room even for the proportions of a Doctor Johnson, which provides much of the allure of the eighteenth century. But such is Miss Hahn's achievement

that her chattiness only intermittently irritates, as crisply her style carries the narrative along,—of the novelist and diarist who was second keeper of Queen Charlotte's robes, the wife of General d'Arblay, and who, at the age of 87, was to outlive "her spiritual descendant, Jane Austen." During subsequent attendance at celebrations incumbent on an enthusiastic member of the Jane Austen Society, the ghost of Fanny served as a shy and sympathetic chaperone — another unexpected pleasure.

A stately pleasure dome

Two years after Fanny was married to her Chevalier, the Prince Regent most reluctantly espoused Caroline of Brunswick. In 1786, nearly a decade earlier, he had taken a "respectable farmhouse" by the sea at Brighton, but 35 years went by before it finally metamorphosed into the Oriental wonder now standing there. In ROYAL PAVILION : A Study in the Romantic, by Clifford Musgrave (*Bredon & Heginbotham*, Brighton. 15*s*.), the progress is traced and charted with the aid of 60 beautiful photographs and drawings. But this is no mere picture book, opportune as its appearance is in Festival year and coinciding as it does with Brighton's special exhibition. As the director of the Royal Pavilion Estate and of the Brighton Library, Art Gallery and Museum, the author is equipped to find "parallels in spirit to the Pavilion in the literature and art" of the period and to devote "special attention to the influence of India and China on the cults of the Picturesque and the Romantic" while the place was evolving. The result of this cycle of Cathay, this Indian dream and these domes of Xanadu being bound up in a biography of that perennial charmer, George IV, to those who have been struck temporarily dumb by his Pavilion outside and in, will be as instructive as it is enjoyable. The rest will only put the book down to take bus, train or 'plane to Brighton.

Bygones

One who is impervious to the charm of "Prinny" and indeed sweepingly asserts that : "Few would contend that his was a character that commended himself to anyone" concedes graciously enough further down the page :

> . . . but the fat, vulgar, ostentatious and rather disgraceful man . . . did much for London, which he loved. It was under him that the city took on the form it still partly possesses. It was under him and owing to his encouragement that some of its finest buildings, loveliest places and most magnificent vistas came into being—due to the encouragement which he gave to his friend and in some manner his protégé, Nash the Architect.

This is the prelude to a description of Regent Street as it used to be, in GHOSTS AND GREASEPAINT by W. MacQueen-Pope (*Robert Hale*. 21*s*.), when the Café Royal was more obviously "a rendezvous for the notables in the world of Art, Literature, the Theatre and Sport, to say nothing of the City." The author's capital letters are not to be despised ; they are his hat-doffings to tradition, his grandee's tribute in a proletarian world. As is to be expected from such a confirmed historian of the theatre most of his ghosts are the players of yesternight and the night before, and his greasepaint their ectoplasm, tambourine-shaking and table-raps. To come down to earth : Mr. MacQueen-Pope's brand of nostalgic enthusiasm, with the help of his hundred and more playbills, cartoons and photographs in character, communicates itself to his reader who, not for the first time, yearns to have been young with Bernhardt, Terry, Irving and Shaw. Nevertheless, he gives a generous enough supply of twentieth century memories on which to build some later ones. For, surely this decade of acting—with its distinctive and always notable Hamlets, a superb Richard III, a *Daphne Laureola*, a *Ring Round the Moon*, and now its two Cleopatras (and not merely for the Queen's performance) and a full-length *Man and Superman*—is going to be the

occasion of a great deal of nostalgic enthusiasm.

Has the film a future ?

Who could say the same for film-land's output during the same period ? With the exception of a group of pictures to be counted perhaps on the fingers of three hands, in retrospect the English-speaking world would seem to have lost the gift of evoking grateful movie memories soon after the advent of talkies. If this is too much of a generalization, the vacuity, vainglory, vulgarity, violence or viciousness of recent films from Hollywood is a hard fact ; it is slowly killing the golden-egged goose. The *coup de grâce* waits to be administered by British television, improving every week, provided it can avoid the same mistakes ; fortunately, it lacks the money that has been the bane of films. This outburst (an improvident use of space) ushers us to A SEAT AT THE CINEMA by Roger Manvell (*Evans.* 12*s.* 6*d.*), beside whose calm statement of the problems besetting the maker, the industry, the star system, the audience and the critic, no impulse to let off steam could long survive. The book is not particularly easy to read ; it has a solemnity of approach only equalled by Mr. Manvell's chairmanship of the Sunday morning critics' programme of the B.B.C. Even so, he has packed it with the kind of information that people who are still hoping to take the film seriously as an " art form " would like to know, supplemented by many excellent photographs taken behind, before and around the scenes, all of which should increase the enjoyment of documentary, educative or entertainment showing.

Ecco Roma

Of course, if some recent films, particularly those from Ealing, had come from France or Italy, they would be the ' rave ' of every critic ; for in the use of nature, of homely incident, of the quirks of human behaviour, and of the byways and highways of towns, these countries have what would seem to be a natural supremacy. Roger Manvell mentions the " small fraction of the cost of even the more modest kind of British subjects, such as *Brief Encounter* and *Passport to Pimlico*", that made *Open City*. And now from that most filmable of places comes Christopher Kininmouth with ROME ALIVE (*John Lehmann.* 18*s.*). Even an amateur like this reader cannot help taking photographs that are sharp, clear, deliciously proportioned and grouped in the enchanted light of Italy and among its miracle buildings, and the appeal of this book, readable as are its industrious descriptions of the city's life, work and play, is in the pictures of John Deakin. They are not guiltless of camera-tilting (the house where Keats died has a particularly sickening list to accommodate the church and all the Spanish steps : a pity this, as the flying, springing leap of them is checked) but their verve, their movement—of men walking and of stones crying out—justifies the book's horrible title ; as if Rome were a cockle on a barrow.

The English at home

And there is just time to return to where the " Roman first stormed the Kentish shores," as Ivor Brown says in his new and completely revised edition of THE HEART OF ENGLAND (*Batsford.* 12*s.* 6*d.*). Here, too, it can be seen beating in the illustrations, although in this book, good as they are, it is the author's voice we listen to as he roams seaport and downs, seeks markets and mills and suburbs, surveying every aspect of life and character with a foretaste of the wit, wisdom and literary style we have come to associate with his name.

GRADE BANYARD

ADVERTISEMENT AND BUSINESS OFFICES : 4, 5 & 6, SOHO SQUARE, LONDON, W.1.
PUBLISHED FOR THE FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW, LTD., BY HORACE MARSHALL & SON, LTD.,
PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY GEERINGS OF ASHFORD, LTD., 80, HIGH STREET, ASHFORD, KENT.
Publishing Department, Temple House, Tallis Street, E.C.4.
PUBLISHED IN ENGLAND.